

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXXI, No. 3

March, 1953



The United States Press and
the Panama Congress - - - - - 131
Brendan C. McNally

Select Historical Readings in Ancient History 158
Daniel D. McGarry

Reviews of Books - - - - - 169

Current Bibliography - - - - - 189

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT - - - - 191

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY PRESS

10 cents a copy

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

\$2.00 a year

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A Service Quarterly for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXXI

March, 1953

No. 3

Editor

EDWARD R. VOLLMAR

Associate Editor

LOWRIE J. DALY

Editorial Board

John Francis Bannon

Thomas L. Coonan

Jasper W. Cross

Anthony F. Czakowski

Joseph P. Donnelly

Martin F. Hasting

Laurence J. Kenny

Daniel D. McGarry

Thomas P. Neill

Paul G. Steinbicker

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Margaret of Metola	169
Feudalism	169
Medieval Art	170
Egypt and the Roman Empire	171
Innocent III, Church Defender	171
Medieval Skepticism and Chaucer	172
Monastic Sites from the Air	173
English Catholics, 1850-1950	174
Britain and the Dominions	174
Soviet State at Its Inception	175
Geography of the U. S. S. R.	177
Europe from 1914 to the Present	178
Main Currents of Western Thought	180
The Catholic Church in Detroit	181
Confident Years, 1885-1915	183
Liquor Tax in the United States	184
Bourbon Democracy in Alabama	185
Fr. Paul of Graymoor	186
The New Nation: A History of the United States during the Confederation	187
Catholic Authors	188

THE UNITED STATES PRESS AND THE PANAMA CONGRESS

BRENDAN C. McNALLY

On December 7, 1824, Simon Bolivar initiated a plan designed to effect a meeting of the Latin American nations at Panama. The Bolivarian proposal, issued from Lima, was embodied in a "circular invitation to the governments of Colombia, Mexico, Central America, Chile, and Brazil." The United States was not listed among the original invitees, but late in the year 1825, through the efforts of her Vice-President, Francisco de Paula Santandar, Colombia extended an invitation to the Republic of the North. The Colombian gesture was duplicated, almost immediately, by similar action on the part of Mexico and the United Provinces of Central America.

United States journalists had followed, as closely as circumstances would permit, the independence struggles of the Latin Americans through a decade and a half. During those fateful fifteen years, 1810-1825, the editors of the United States newspapers had been well-nigh universally of one mind in their desire to see Portuguese and Spanish rule crushed, once and for all, in the Americas. They were not, however, similarly of one mind with respect to the nature of United States participation in the projected Panama Congress.¹

Newspaper discussion of United States representation at Panama first began in April, 1825, several months previous to the above-mentioned invitations extended by the governments of Colombia, Mexico, and the United Provinces of Central America. On April 21, the *National Gazette*, Philadelphia, reprinted in translation, an article from the *Official Gazette* of Bogota. The article was, in the main, a summary of the matters to be discussed at the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama. Robert Walsh, editor of the *National Gazette*, was rather cool toward any proposal suggestive of United States participation:

The writer of the Bogota article thinks that the United States, and the other American powers sim-

Father McNally is Professor of History at the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.

¹ The writer can fully attest to the unanimity of United States newspaper opinion during the Independence Era, 1810-1825, from research entailed in the writing of a doctoral dissertation, *Coverage and Attitudes of the United States Press Relative to the Independence Movements in the Spanish Americas, 1810-1825*, St. Louis University, 1949.

ilarly circumstanced, will not refuse to depute representatives to the Panama Congress, in order to deliberate and act as to the latter series of objects. We shall not undertake to say what ought to be the decision of our government on this point, but we are sure that there are weighty obstacles to compliance, and we are, moreover, free to confess that we do not consider the new American States as quite ripe for the arrangements in question.²

In their issue of the *National Intelligencer* for Tuesday, April 26, Joseph Gales and W. W. Seaton reprinted the above observations of Walsh, without comment. The same issue of the *National Intelligencer* carried a reprint from the *Democratic Press*, Philadelphia, of a long article signed, "Mutius Scaevola," urged the United States government to send delegates to the Congress at Panama and proposed the formation of a confederation in the Americas similar to the Confederation of the Rhine, the Holy Alliance, and the Union of England, Scotland, and Ireland. The editors of the *Intelligencer* replied, by way of answer to Scaevola's proposals, that the matter would be decided properly by the government; that we should not send representatives to the Congress if such action would entail the surrender of our independence; that we might well send representatives if the Congress is to be of a purely consultative nature, but not otherwise; and finally, Gales and Seaton concluded:

Against the magnificent scheme of the Philadelphia Mutius we enter our decided protest. We want not his Areopagus, any more than we do the Amphictyons. For our Areopagus we are satisfied with our *Bench of Judges*, and for our Council of Amphictyons we choose our own Congress. We desire, in fine, to be

² *National Gazette*, Philadelphia, Thursday, April 21, 1825. Cf. *Louisiana Gazette*, New Orleans, Tuesday, May 24, 1825, for reprint from the *Constitutional Whig*, Richmond, Va., of notice concerning the Panama Congress. The Congress, declared the *Whig*, "Will in a short time present to the world, as interesting a spectacle as has ever been witnessed." Note: The newspapers consulted, the *Louisiana Gazette* and the *Missouri Republican* excepted, were read at the Library of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts. The file of the *Louisiana Gazette* for 1825 was read at the New Orleans Public Library and that of the *Missouri Republican*, St. Louis, for 1825, was read at the library of the Missouri Historical Society, Jefferson Memorial, St. Louis, Missouri. For the reading of the *National Intelligencer*, *Richmond Enquirer*, *New York American* the "tri-weekly" editions were used.

members of no Confederation more comprehensive than that of the United States of America.³

Hezekiah Niles of the *Weekly Register*, Baltimore, a long-time and most loyal supporter of the Republican cause in the Spanish Americas, was, however, favorable to United States representation.

We are persuaded that the United States and the other American powers similarly situated, will not refuse to concur in the plan of a congress at Panama, by means of plenipotentiaries.⁴

It was not until October that the *Richmond Enquirer* ventured any opinion on the matter, and the opinion that was forthcoming at that time was decidedly in opposition to United States participation in the Panama meeting.

American Confederation

The Bogota papers to the 8th September have been received at the office of the Baltimore Federal Gazette, and from them the following interesting State Paper is extracted. It exhibits in an official form, the origin and designs of the Congress of Panama, concerning which so many private rumors and speculations have been for some time propagated. Though it is not the interest of our own country to accede to the plan, and to despatch ministers to the Congress (agreeably to the invitation which is said to have been extended to us), yet the same principles do not apply to those newly created states, which are more intimately connected by their own local situation, by the identity of their interests, and by their opposition to a common enemy.

The article closes with the recommendation that the South American nations confederate against their common foe, the Holy Alliance.⁵

The *National Gazette*, in one of its November issues, retreated somewhat from the position it had adopted in April. The *Gazette*,

³ *National Intelligencer*, Washington, D. C., Tuesday, April 26, 1825. Cf. *National Intelligencer*, Thursday, May 12, for reprint from the *Virginian*, Richmond, Va. The writer in the *Virginian* maintained that the Congress was a "magnificent scheme," but participation did not accord with our policy. Furthermore, the good consequences were clear and the evils resultant might prove many.

⁴ *Weekly Register*, Baltimore, Hezekiah Niles, editor, April 30, 1825, 3rd printing, XXVII, 132. For additional comment by Niles, cf. *Weekly Register*, November 19, 1825. XXXIX, 182.

⁵ *Richmond Enquirer*, Richmond, Virginia, Thomas Ritchie and Claiborne W. Gooch, editors, Friday, October 21, 1825.

in November, conceded that it might be prudent for us to send a minister to the meeting of the American States. Walsh was certain that the destinies of Porto Rico [sic] and Cuba would be settled at the meeting and urged that we have someone present to take part in the discussions relative to the fate of Cuba. This latter island, according to Walsh, was most important to us because of its possible influences on the peace and welfare of our Southern States.⁶

The *Massachusetts Spy*, Worcester, in early May, made reference to the *National Gazette* article of Thursday, April 21, but made no comment pro or con.⁷ Again, in early June, the *Spy* quoted an article from the *National Journal* of Washington. The *Spy*, on this latter occasion likewise, refrained from taking a stand.⁸ The *New York American*, however, was unalterably opposed to United States participation and stated its position quite directly and bluntly.

Respecting the Congress at Panama, to which it seems the United States have been invited by Mexico and Colombia to send deputies, it is difficult while yet uninformed of the objects of that Congress to determine what course ought to be pursued by this government. One leading principle of our policy has been, in doing equal justice to all nations, to avoid entangling alliances with any; and this principle is no less applicable to the nations of this continent, than of the other. True, indeed, the fact of taking part in a congress, does not necessarily involve alliance, or participation in action or counsel; but if some joint expression or opinion, or combination of measures be contemplated, we see no very definite object to the meeting; and if this be the object, we see great objection to this country taking a part in it. . . . We cannot, therefore, see any good to result from sending envoys to the congress at Panama.⁹

Newspaper interest in the Panama Congress was increased considerably by the pronouncement of President John Quincy Adams, in his message to the First Session of the 19th Congress, that he intended to send delegates to Panama. The *Richmond Enquirer* immediately challenged Adams' right to depute minis-

⁶ *National Gazette*, Thursday, November 24, 1825. Cf. *Richmond Enquirer*, Friday, December 2, for reprint of same.

⁷ *Massachusetts Spy*, Worcester, Wednesday, May 4, 1825.

⁸ *Massachusetts Spy*, Wednesday, June 8, 1825.

⁹ *New York American*, Tuesday, November 29, 1825.

ters without first securing the permission of Congress.¹⁰ The *Enquirer's* initial attack on Adams' proposal to send ministers to the sessions at Panama was published on Thursday, December 8, and was followed by a second protest on the part of Ritchie and Gooch in their issue of Thursday, December 20.¹¹

Benjamin Russell of the Boston *Columbian Centinel* had taken little notice of the Panama Congress throughout the year 1825. When, however, challenge was made to Adams' declaration of intent to send representatives, Russell undertook an answer to the critics of the President.

General Congress of Panama—One of the most interesting of the many important articles of information contained in the President's Message is the one which announces that the United States had accepted the invitation made by the Republics of Colombia, Mexico and Central America to be represented in the Congress assembling at the Isthmus of Panama, to deliberate upon objects important to the welfare of all: And that the Ministers on the part of the United States will be commissioned to attend at the deliberations, and to take part in them, so far as may be compatible with the neutrality from which it is neither our intention, nor the desire of the American States that we should depart. . . . It has been asked, by what authority the President makes this appointment? The answer is ready: *The law of May, 1822*, by which appropriations were made "*for such missions to the Independent Nations on the American continent, as the President of the United States may deem proper.*"¹²

On the same day that Russell published the above defense of Adams, the *Massachusetts Spy* informed its readers that the preliminaries of the Congress at Panama were progressing nicely and added:

The Republics of Colombia, of Mexico, and of Central America have already deputed Plenipotentiaries to such a meeting, and they have invited the United States to be also represented there by their Ministers. The invitation has been accepted, and Ministers on the part of the United States will be commissioned to attend at those deliberations, and to take part in them, so far as may be compatible with that neutrality from which

¹⁰ *Richmond Enquirer*, Thursday, December 8, 1825. Ritchie and Gooch felt that Adams should have first consulted with Congress.

¹¹ *Richmond Enquirer*, Thursday, December 20, 1825.

¹² *Columbian-Centinel*, Boston, Wednesday, December 14, 1825.

it is neither our intention, nor the desire of the other American states that we should depart.¹³

Surprisingly enough, papers which had early manifested considerable interest in the Panama Congress did not comment upon the portion of Adams' Message that made reference to the meeting of American states. The *National Gazette* and the *New York American* published the full text of the President's Message, but refrained from comment upon the reference to Panama. The *Louisiana Gazette*, New Orleans, praised the Message, in very general terms, in its issue of Thursday, December 29, with no specific comment upon any particular portion. The *Missouri Republican*, St. Louis, on Thursday, January 5, 1826, published the entire text of the Message without comment. Hezekiah Niles of the *Weekly Register*, likewise, printed only the text of the Message. The editors of the *National Intelligencer*, however, after having read the Message, were satisfied that President Adams' plan would cost us not one jot of our independence nor, so they thought, would the action entangle us in any alliance. Forthwith, they supported the proposed action of the President.

The urgent calls of business in other directions have not yet allowed us to peruse, with all the deliberation desirable for a second reading, the Message of the President to Congress. We shall have occasion to speak of the various parts of it, as we shall find ourselves impressed by them.

The most immediately interesting part of the Message, is the determination to send Ministers to represent the United States at the Congress of Panama. It gives us pleasure to find that this is to be done under instructions to them to act as counsellors only, and with a perfect understanding, between this and other governments, that no deviation is expected of the United States from that strict neutrality which it has heretofore declared and maintained between the present belligerents—and, of course, that the idea of *alliance* between the United States and those powers is wholly out of the question.

The functions of the Ministers who are to be sent to that conference are, nevertheless, of the gravest and most confidential nature, and demand the aid of the best talents of the country. Conjecture is already busy as to who are to compose the mission. Among the names which have been mentioned are those of Albert Gallatin

¹³ *Massachusetts Spy*, Wednesday, December 14, 1825.

and William H. Crawford. By the selection of either or both of these eminent citizens for that station, whether it should be their pleasure to accept it or not, the President would act magnanimously. It is probable, however, though we have no means of knowing the fact, that the selection, upon whomever it may devolve, has already been made.¹⁴

A few days after the publication of the above, the editors returned to the matter of the Panama Congress and the United States. Willing they were to send delegates, but they unqualifiedly opposed to United States membership in any Confederation of American States.

We then said, and we repeat, that we never wish to live under any other Confederation, or to be under the government of any other Congress, than that of these United States. The elder sisters of the Union have successively admitted the younger, and will yet admit others, to take place with them at the family council board, but cannot consent to place strangers on the same footing with their kin, however cheerfully and frankly they open to them the door of hospitality, or extend to them the embrace of friendship.¹⁵

1826

The criticism levelled by the *Richmond Enquirer* at President Adams for his reference to Panama in his Message to Congress evoked sharp response from the *Massachusetts Spy* in early January of 1826.

Congress of Panama—The *Richmond Enquirer* finds fault with the President for saying in his Message, that Ministers will be commissioned to attend the Congress of Panama; and two or three other papers have expressed similar sentiments. The objection made is, that the President has no authority to originate new

¹⁴ *National Intelligencer*, Saturday, December 10, 1825.

¹⁵ *National Intelligencer*, Tuesday, December 13, 1825. Gales & Seaton here make reference to the stand they had taken in their issue of Tuesday, April 26, 1825. Cf. *supra*, footnote No. 3. Cf. *Weekly Register*, Saturday, December 31, 1825, for announcement that President Adams had nominated to the Senate, as commissioners to the Panama meeting, Richard C. Anderson of Kentucky and currently Minister at Bogota; John Sergeant, a prominent Philadelphia lawyer and former member of Congress, 1815-1823; Mr. William B. Rochester, one of the Circuit Judges of the State of New York was nominated as secretary to the commission. Niles was certain that these nominations to the Senate would quiet the fears of the *Richmond Enquirer* that the President was acting in too-high-handed a manner with respect to Panama.

missions, and therefore it was improper to announce that the Ministers would be commissioned before the approbation of Congress was obtained. Under existing circumstances, however, we apprehend the course taken by the President, if not the best, is certainly justifiable. A law was passed authorizing the President *to send such missions to the South American States as he should deem advisable*, and the embassies heretofore sent to those States have been sent by that authority. . . . A nomination has been made to the Senate, and we have no doubt it will be confirmed, and that the Ministers "will be commissioned."¹⁶

The *Yeoman*, Worcester, Mass., also drew the fire of the *Spy* for its attitude towards Adams relative to Panama. In one article the *Yeoman* had maintained that President Adams had no more right to depute ministers to the meeting of American States than he would have had to depute ministers to the Congress of Vienna. In a second article the *Yeoman* insisted that Adams had "no authority" for his promise to send delegates. The *Spy* editor referred the *Yeoman* to his article of January 11, and added that the President does have the power to designate ministers, but must have the concurrence of the Senate for the nomination of specific ministers. Therefore, concluded the *Spy*, the President is not guilty of violating the Constitution nor is he attempting any usurpation of powers.¹⁷

Through the early weeks of 1826, the United States newspaper editors speculated as to the disposition the Senate would make of Adams' request that Richard Anderson and John Sergeant be confirmed as delegates to Panama. The Senate debated the matter of the confirmations in closed sessions, and consequently the editors were compelled to rely on hearsay reports for their news. The *New York American*, which had opposed the mission in November, 1825, reaffirmed its opinion as to the expediency of the undertaking. The *American* had learned from the columns of the *National Intelligencer* that President Adams had nominated Anderson, Sergeant, and Rochester.

These nominations are we think very good. Mr. Anderson has acquitted himself very creditably at Bogota, and Mr. John Sergeant is of the number of our citizens that we may be proud to show any where [sic]. Mr.

¹⁶ *Massachusetts Spy*, Wednesday, January 11, 1826. Cf., *supra* footnotes No. 9, No. 10.

¹⁷ *Massachusetts Spy*, Wednesday, January 18, 1826.

Rochester is one of the Circuit Judges of this State. These nominations have as yet not been acted upon in the Senate, not as we apprehend from any indisposition to confirm them, if any Commissioners are to be sent to Panama, but from hesitation as to the expediency of the mission itself. On this latter point we are too little informed as to the objects and purposes of the Congress, to be able to form a satisfactory opinion.¹⁸

The *National Intelligencer*, the quasi-official organ of happenings in Washington, did its best to keep its readers and the country informed as to the progress of the Panama measure in Congress.

The subject of the Mission to Panama has not yet been decided upon in the Senate. It is said that it meets with serious opposition in that body, the particulars of which (the Proceedings of the Senate on such subjects being confidential,) we have it not in our power to disclose to our readers.¹⁹

The introduction into the House of the appropriations bill to underwrite the expenses of the mission was reported.

The subject of the Panama Mission has, it will be seen, been introduced into the House of Representatives, by Mr. Miner of Pennsylvania. We have no indications by which to judge of the feelings of either House of Congress on the subject, further than that there is a division of opinion in relation to it. How it happens, we know not, but so it is, that there appears to be a great indifference to the subject in the public mind. We shall probably find it more excited when the measure comes to be openly discussed.²⁰

On several occasions during February and into early March the *Intelligencer* informed the public that, reports to the contrary notwithstanding, the measure was still being discussed by the Senate. "It was currently and confidentially reported, last evening, that the Panama mission was, in the sitting of yester-

¹⁸ *New York American*, Wednesday, January 4, 1826. Cf., *American*, Friday, January 6, for report from Washington that the Panama Mission and the Creek Treaty were the two big items before Congress and that it would seem the Senate and the House would go along with the President with respect to the former. Again, on Friday, January 27, and Friday, February 3, similar reports were published in the *American*.

¹⁹ *National Intelligencer*, Tuesday, January 17, 1826.

²⁰ *National Intelligencer*, Thursday, January 26, 1826.

day, rejected. This, however, is not correct."²¹ Again, on Thursday, February 23, Saturday, February 25, and March 4, the editors assured all who read the *Intelligencer* that the Panama question was still undecided.

While most of the editors preferred to speculate during the days the Panama question was being discussed behind closed doors in Congress, Robert Walsh of the *National Gazette* editorialized at great length on the merits of the mission. Walsh informed his readers that debate on the Panama question was underway in the House of Representatives and continued.

With respect to the Mission itself to Panama, which some of the speakers represented as an extraordinary, splendid, startling, portentous project, that may involve us in the most perilous alliances offensive and defensive, we must confess that it appears to us, as yet, in the light of a simple and harmless affair. The President has pledged himself that nothing shall be done incompatible with the neutrality of the United States; the gentlemen nominated as envoys are not likely to exceed their instructions; we may presume that their proceedings in the Congress will be definite and open, and so guarded as to limit the responsibility of the United States to the proper safe degree: under the direction of our government, they have fully in their own power the nature and extent of their steps; it is not a case in which they can be insensibly or forcibly drawn into positive arrangements or dangerous compacts; it is a business of amity, observation, counsel, or friendly consultation at the most.²²

A violent attack on the projected mission to Panama delivered by John Randolph before the Senate on March 1, drew the fire of Walsh. Randolph had implied that any United States ministers to Panama would be compelled to "cross the color-line" and to deal with inferior peoples.

We copy from the *National Intelligencer*, a speech delivered by Mr. Randolph in the Senate on Wednesday, which we regard as one of the most curious, indiscreet and unreasonable that can be found in the annals of our Congress. Supposing what he says, in relation to Cuba

²¹ *National Intelligencer*, Tuesday, February 21, 1826. The editors in cities removed from Washington relied, for the most part, on the *National Intelligencer* and "letters from Washington," for their news of the actions of Congress.

²² *National Gazette*, Friday, February 3, 1826.

and the Southern States can be true, how imprudent the topic; how irregular his whole aim; and how wild his episodes! But we should commit this extravagant production to the judgment of our readers, without further animadversion.²³

Through the weeks that Congress debated the question of the mission, the *Richmond Enquirer* maintained a hostile attitude toward the same. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on February 3, calling upon the president to furnish additional information, gave Ritchie and Gooch an opportunity to editorialize.

Panama Mission

Mr. Webster's Resolution has at length prevailed in the H. of R.—and the President is now called upon, to lay before them, within such bounds as his discretion may point out, such correspondence and information as he may possess respecting the *general character* of the expected Congress; and *as to what objects* the agents of the U. S. are expected to take, in its deliberations. The propriety of the mission at all will very much depend upon the nature of this communication. Many of our citizens and of their Representatives [sic] have suspended the formation of a decisive opinion, until they could have all the *facts fairly* before them. Many of them are averse, upon general grounds, to so novel an extension of our foreign intercourse; but they wait to see whether there is anything undisclosed to make this case an exception to the general principle. They wait, therefore, with anxiety the result of this application for papers.²⁴

Later in the same month the editors declared themselves mystified by the whole matter.

The Panama Question is absolutely a mystery to us. The President will not obey the call of the H. of R.—and the Senate have not yet acted finally upon the nomination. An Alexandrian paper, which has been so sanguine of a decision from day to day, now suggests

²³ *National Gazette*, Saturday, March 4, 1826. In his issue for this day Walsh printed Randolph's speech in digest form. The speech was later printed in its entirety by Walsh, Thursday, March 9, 1826. Randolph feared, among other things, that the Panama Congress would discuss the abolition of slavery. Quotes are the writer's.

²⁴ *Richmond Enquirer*, Tuesday, February 7, 1826. Webster's resolution had been carried on February 3, "by a large majority."

that it may not be effected for three or four days. It is said, that the Senate have not yet even debated the expediency of the mission! They have not gone yet upon the merits of the question.²⁵

On March 4, the *Enquirer* carried a scathing attack on Adams' administration and mentioned, among other things, the Panama mission.²⁶ Three days later, March 7, the *Enquirer* reprinted from the *Wilmington, Delaware, Gazette*, a long article which described the history of Webster's resolution and the legislative maneuverings of Congress. The article continued:

We cannot, of course, know what are the precise objects of the Congress of Panama, or what are the views of the President in wishing to send ministers to attend it; but it has always appeared to us clear that for this country to have any connection with it, was a measure fraught with danger to ourselves, and not calculated to be of any advantage to those who might be supposed to have an immediate interest in its organization and deliberation.

The article concluded with the counsel to follow the tradition set by George Washington with regard to foreign entanglements.²⁷

As the debates in Congress dragged on into March the *Massachusetts Spy* became convinced that certain politicians had organized to embarrass Adams on this issue and were using it as a rallying point to oppose the administration. "How wise they have been in this instance, time must determine; it is very clear that a vast majority of *the People* are with the Executive."²⁸ In the same issue of the *Spy* the following appeared.

In order to give our readers some idea of the feelings elicited by the discussion of the Panama question, at Washington, and of the pains taken to enlist the passions and prejudices of the Southern Section of the Union in opposition to the nomination, we have published the remarks of John Randolph, in the Senate, on introducing a resolution calling on the President for information. The remarks will be found in the legislative proceedings.²⁹

²⁵ *Richmond Enquirer*, Tuesday, February 28, 1826.

²⁶ *Richmond Enquirer*, Saturday, March 4, 1826.

²⁷ *Richmond Enquirer*, Tuesday, March 7, 1826. Reprint from *Wilmington, Delaware, Gazette*.

²⁸ *Massachusetts Spy*, Wednesday, March 8, 1826.

²⁹ *Massachusetts Spy*, Wednesday, March 8, 1826.

Hezekiah Niles was, like many of his countrymen, opposed to entangling alliances, but he was, also, fearful that the actions of Congress might lose us the friendship of the South American nations. Further, averred Niles, Great Britain would have her agents present at Panama to obtain favor for British manufactures.

The Panama question remains as it was, and this is the chief thing that can be said to be *known* about it. . . . We are opposed to any proceeding that may involve us in "entangling alliances," but think that much responsibility will rest upon those by whose conduct our government shall be made to appear unkind, or uncivil, to the people of the new governments in the south, who ought to be as our *natural friends*. Great Britain, though uninvited, will have agents at Panama; and if she shall make a monopoly of the good will of the congress, the trade, manufactures and commerce of our country will suffer more by it in one year, than would pay the salary of a *president* of the United States for a hundred.

Niles concluded the foregoing with a scathing criticism of Mr. Randolph's speech in Congress.³⁰ Two weeks later, Niles published an article entitled, "The Panama Question—The Senate, And Mr. Randolph," in which he again indicted the actions and debates in the Senate and informed his readers that the vote in the Senate had been twenty-five in favor of the Panama Mission, and nineteen opposed to the same. The article then continued:

As to the mission—if it shall divest us of our neutral character even in respect to such a contemptible power as Spain, further than it was, and is, by acknowledging the independence of the new states and in making treaties with them as sovereign powers, the people would generally oppose it; but if to advise with the delegates from Mexico, Colombia, etc., on affairs interesting to this continent—if to compliment them on their liberation—and, by courtesy and good dispositions, to cultivate their kind feelings for us, as the elder sister-nation, is the purpose of the mission—everybody shall approve of it: for these states are of incalculable importance to the agricultural, manufacturing and commercial interests of the United States; and there is reason to fear that already our great rival in the two

³⁰ *Weekly Register*, March 4, 1826, XXX, 1.

last, may have succeeded in establishing a *predominating* feeling in favor of herself, which will be difficult for us to remove.³¹

The *National Intelligencer* was quick to inform its readers of the results of the vote in the Senate and the editors seized upon the opportunity to make a few observations upon the question.

The Panama Mission—The nomination of two Ministers to the Congress at Panama, it will be seen by the Extract from the Journal of Executive Proceedings of the Senate, (in the supplement of today,) has been confirmed. . . . The result is that Richard C. Anderson and John Sergeant have been appointed by the President of the United States, with consent of the Senate, to be Ministers to the assembly of American nations at the Congress of Panama.

The question has occupied much of the time of the Senate, and has been the subject of some excitement in Congress, as may be gathered from the hints thrown out in the open debates in both Houses. We are under the impression, however, that among the People it has produced no extraordinary excitement, but rather a sensation of surprise that so much importance has been attached to it, in the estimation of the Senate, as to require the protracted discussions to which it is supposed to have given rise in that body.

If, indeed, it has been proposed that the United States should send Deputies to the Congress of American States, on the Amphictyonic principle, the proposition could not have produced too great an excitement. We should, ourselves, consider such a proposition, much as we dislike the term, as an overt act of moral treason—and the consummation of it as the deathwarrant [sic] of the independence of this Nation. Contemplating *such* an overture many months ago, we deprecated the acceptance of it in the strongest language. Nor, after much reflection, should we now speak of such a proposition in more measured terms. We were rejoiced, therefore, when we found, from the Message of the President, that the overture in that shape had been peremptorily declined, but that it was proposed to send Ministers to be present at the deliberations of the Congress, without compromising, in any manner, the peace or neutrality of the United States, or pledging this Government to any system of measures which the Congress may determine upon.

Thus limited, we incline to think that the People of

³¹ *Weekly Register*, March 18, 1826, XXX, 33, 34.

the United States, with the information before us and them, rather favor the measure than otherwise, without feeling any deep interest in it, one way or the other.³²

The significance of Adams' attitude toward Panama was not lost on Gales and Seaton, and they justified the Presidential action by the observation that the policy outlined by George Washington in his Farewell Address was not applicable to relations between the United States and the South American nations. In their issue of Tuesday, March 28, they published documents related to the Panama Mission and observed:

The documents which we have made public on this occasion, we look upon as the most important and consequential which have seen the light since the negotiation of the Treaty of Ghent. They open to us a wide field, giving to us glimpses of a new set of relations with the foreign world, evidently not contemplated at the formation of our Constitution, nor even at the later era, when Washington retired from the helm of state, bequeathing to this countrymen those political axioms which compose his Farewell Address—for in that address there is not the least allusion to the birth, much less to the maturity, of independent Nations on this Continent, already able to compete in arms, and in the science of government, with those of the old world.³³

The *Massachusetts Spy* of Wednesday, March 29 printed the full text of President Adams' Message to the House of Repre-

³² *National Intelligencer*, Thursday, March 16, 1826. Cf. *National Intelligencer*, Supplement, Saturday, March 18, 1826, for full text of President John Quincy Adams' Message to the House of Representatives, Wednesday, March 15. It is to the contents of this message that the above article of March 16 makes reference. Cf., likewise, *National Intelligencer*, Tuesday, March 21, for spirited reply by Gales and Seaton to charge made by the *Washington Telegraph* that the *Intelligencer* had supported Adams simply to obtain governmental printing work.

³³ *National Intelligencer*, Tuesday, March 28, 1826. It is interesting to note that later in this same article the editors observed that the Monroe Doctrine was more pregnant with momentous doctrine than any other state paper since the Declaration of Independence. Cf. *National Intelligencer*, Tuesday, April 25 for article critical of House Representatives for the manner in which it finally disposed of the Panama question. The House acceded to Adams' wishes, but did so in a rather inconsistent manner. Cf. *Intelligencer*, Thursday, July 13, for reply to charge made in the House of Representatives by Mr. Ingham of Pennsylvania, that the *Intelligencer's* attitude toward Panama had been dictated by Adams. Gales and Seaton vigorously denied the charge.

sentatives, March 15, and in the same issue took issue with the Worcester *Yeoman* over the latter's charge that the President had overreached himself when he announced that he would send representatives to the Panama meeting. The *Spy* again called upon the *Yeoman* to stop its bickering and accept the fact that President Adams accepted the invitations to send ministers to Panama only with the implicit reservation of Senatorial concurrence.³⁴

The contents of Adams' Message to the House of Representatives may have satisfied other editors, but not Messrs. Ritchie and Gooch of the *Richmond Enquirer*. They disliked Adams intensely and had opposed the President's Panama policy from the very beginning. On Tuesday, March 21, they published the Message and then proceeded to editorialize.

The Secret Proceedings of the Senate, and the President's Communication to the H. of R. are now before us. . . .

We are anxious to see the Documents; but there is nothing in the President's Message to shake the objections we took in October last to such a Mission. The Congress of Panama is a wise measure for the states of South America. They have a common enemy to encounter; they have a common cause, common interests; and it is most expedient for them to make a common effort for their mutual protection! But we have no motive to join them in this enterprize [sic]: we have no cause to dread Spain: and instead of viewing her as an enemy, we should treat her as a neutral if not a friend.—Should the Holy Alliance, indeed, threaten to attack the cause of liberty in S. America, then it would be time for us to interfere, and to combine our efforts. But, there is no prospect at this time of such a combination.

The editors concluded with the traditional counsel that both George Washington and Thomas Jefferson had warned the nation to avoid entangling alliances of a political nature.³⁵ On March 31 the *Enquirer* again criticized President Adams' Panama policy,³⁶ and in April reprinted an anti-Panama article from the *Washington Telegraph*.

³⁴ *Massachusetts Spy*, Wednesday, March 29, 1826. Cf. *supra*, Footnote No. 17.

³⁵ *Richmond Enquirer*, Tuesday, March 21, 1826.

³⁶ *Richmond Enquirer*, Friday, March 31, 1826.

Washington, April 21.—A reference to the Congressional Proceedings will not fail to satisfy the intelligent reader as to the course that should be adopted by the Executive on the Panama question. . . . What tack will be taken next is quite uncertain. But of one thing we are sure. Nothing less than a state of desperation could justify any administration in persevering in a mission so very unpopular; not to say unprecedented and dangerous.³⁷

The same issue of the *Enquirer* carried a reprint from the *Trenton True American* which castigated President Adams for his actions, for sponsoring "such measures, as the Panama mission, with the inconsistent reason on which it has been urged." The *True American* warns the President that the people are not slaves and that they will think and act for themselves.³⁸

Ritchie and Gooch were veritable die-hards as regards the Panama Mission for they continued to voice their opposition to the same long after the Senate and the House of Representatives had submitted to the wishes of President Adams. It would seem that editors of the *Enquirer* carried an editorial, very sarcastic in tone, which, again called Adams to task for his Panama venture.³⁹ In June the editors reprinted an article from the *New York National Advertiser* which noted the fact that France, Great Britain, Holland, Spain, and Portugal planned to send "observers" to Panama and then concluded:

We, of the United States, the first that should have adopted such semi-official steps, have sent a formal mission, tied up, it is true, by the public voice, but still having more powers than should have been conferred. Must we learn wisdom from foreign powers!⁴⁰

In early July the *Enquirer* reprinted a long article from the *Trenton Emporium* which treated of the Panama question and insisted that the administration had made a great mistake by its rejection of the counsel extended by George Washington.⁴¹ Again

³⁷ *Richmond Enquirer*, Tuesday, April 25, 1826. Reprint from *Washington Telegraph*. Cf. *Enquirer*, Tuesday, April 4, and Friday, April 7, for letters relative to Panama signed "P. Henry."

³⁸ *Richmond Enquirer*, Tuesday, April 25, 1826. Reprint from the *Trenton*, New Jersey, *True American*.

³⁹ *Richmond Enquirer*, Tuesday, May 9, 1826.

⁴⁰ *Richmond Enquirer*, Tuesday, June 27, 1826. Reprint from New York, *National Advertiser*.

⁴¹ *Richmond Enquirer*, Friday July 7, 1826. Reprint from Trenton, New Jersey, *Emporium*.

in August, the *Enquirer* published a violently anti-Adams editorial and declared, among other things, that his Message at the opening of the last Congress was "more directly at war with the theory of our Constitution than any paper which any other man has ever dared to promulgate."⁴² In the same issue there appeared a letter signed "Independence," in which the writer declared Adams had lost the confidence of the people and had acted at variance with the policy of Washington. The Panama Mission is cited as "a striking and melancholy example."⁴³

Hezekiah Niles, quite naturally, was gratified by the action taken by the Senate and the House of Representatives and was pleased to inform his readers that the Mission had been approved by the Senate and the monies appropriated by the House of Representatives. Thus he felt the matter was ended, but he thought it proper to manifest some surprise at the opposition and bitter wrangling that the Mission had occasioned. However, he thought there was no reason for anyone to worry about the conduct of our Ministers at Panama.

The people will determine who is right—for all the facts appertaining to this interesting affair, will be made public. The administration owes this to itself, and to the nation; and will not neglect to make a full exposition of all that shall transpire at Panama, so far as justice and good faith to others may admit the promulgation of it.⁴⁴

Benjamin Russell of the Boston *Columbian-Centinel* endeavored to follow the fate of the Mission in Congress as best he could through the media of "Letters from Washington" and items from papers published near the national capital. In his issue of Saturday, March 18, he quoted the *Alexandrian Phenix* as remarking that the situation in the Senate was tense. Russell, himself, then continued in a sarcastic vein:

The majority in favor of the mission is said to be *five*; and if so, it will be apparent to the American People that they have already exhibited an almost unparalleled degree of magnanimity and forbearance.⁴⁵

Russell printed the full text of Adams' Message of March 15, to the House of Representatives in his issue of the *Centinel*,

⁴² *Richmond Enquirer*, Friday, August 25, 1826.

⁴³ *Richmond Enquirer*, Friday, August 25, 1826.

⁴⁴ *Weekly Register*, April 29, 1826, XXX, 153.

⁴⁵ *Columbian Centinel*, Saturday, March 18, 1826.

Saturday, March 25. In the same issue Russell set down in forthright manner his personal views on the Panama question.

Panama Mission. The President's Message on this subject will be found to be a liberal, independent, ingenious, and satisfactory exposition of the policy and patriotism which dictated his acceptance of the invitation of our Sister Republics and neighbors, that the First-born of the American Republics should be represented as [sic] the first Family meeting to deliberate on things belonging to their Peace, and to the establishment of their Independence; to witness the rectitude of their motives; and to consult on the best means to perpetuate their relations with their Elder Sister. It will also be found to afford ample evidence of the wisdom, justice, and forecast of the Executive, in prescribing the exact line of duty and conduct of the Delegates which should be appointed. —and to prove, moreover, how entirely void of reason have been the fears and anticipation of "war and havoc" as arising from the measure, which have so long and so often been proclaimed by Partizans [sic] who make pretensions to Statesmanship and sound policy; and to produce, what letters from *Washington* say, it has already produced, the "*sealing of the mouths of gainsayers; and exposing the motives of men, who with Republicanism on their tongues, have hearts full of malice, personal animosity, and aristocracy.*"⁴⁶

Likewise, in his issue of March 25, Russell cast doubt upon a current rumour that Chile and Peru would not send delegates to Panama. He felt certain that documents transmitted to Congress by President Adams would contradict the content of the rumour. On Wednesday, March 29, Russell informed his readers that the official documents received by Congress contradicted the "late report" that Peru and Chile would not send representatives to the Panama meeting. Further, "Letters from Washington" indicated that passage of the appropriations bill would take place shortly.⁴⁷

The *New York American*, which had opposed the sending of delegates to Panama when first the subject was discussed in 1825, adopted a definitely pro-Panama attitude in 1826. In late Feb-

⁴⁶ *Columbian-Centinel*, Saturday, March 25, 1826.

⁴⁷ *Columbian-Centinel*, Wednesday, March 29, 1826. In this same issue Russell declared that documents published in "Washington papers" stated explicitly that the South American governments had distinctly stated that they did not require that the United States should "*compromit*" its neutrality and harmony with other nations.

ruary, like all the other papers, the *American* waited anxiously for information from Washington concerning the fate of the Panama question in Congress.

We have nothing from Washington respecting the Panama mission, except the rumour of its rejection and a contradiction of the same. The President has not answered the call of the house, doubtless from delicacy to the Senate, which, however, proper in itself is misplaced as regards them. In delaying as they have done a decision on this subject while so many others more trivial have been dispatched, they have evinced a studied disregard of the executive which deprives them of all claim on him for any extraordinary marks of respect. We think the course of the administration and its friends very clear. Let the house make appropriations for the mission; let them act (as in so doing they would) in unison with the feelings of the country, and let a scant majority of the Senate oppose the popular will at their peril. An opposition is determined on, and as well organized as its incongruous materials will permit; its leaders with a singular want of tact have taken the unpopular side, and it only requires an ordinary share of sagacity to keep them there.

The article concludes with the warning that the malcontents will gain only by injuring our cordiality with the South American nations and the prophetic fear that the Panama Congress may be ended before our delegates can arrive.⁴⁸

The dilatory actions of the Senate evoked several sharp editorials in the *American* during the month of March. On Friday, March 3, the Senate was criticized because it permitted a minority of its members to delay important legislation. The actions of the Senate "cannot but impair the weight and dignity of our interposition in the congress."⁴⁹ On Tuesday, March 7, the *American* published some extracts from John Randolph's speech "for the edification of such of our readers as may wish to know on what grounds the opposition to government [sic] rest their claim to support at this eventful crisis."⁵⁰ In the same issue the

⁴⁸ *New York American*, Tuesday, February 28, 1826. Under dateline, Friday, February 24. Cf. *American*, Tuesday, February 14, 1826 for long pro-Panama article signed, "Sully." Cf., likewise, *American*, Tuesday, February 28, for long article under Washington dateline and very critical of Congress for delay on solution of Panama question.

⁴⁹ *New York American*, Friday, March 3, 1826.

⁵⁰ *New York American*, Tuesday, March 7, 1826. Article very critical of John Randolph.

members of the Senate are again called to task for resorting to "Every little act of delay, and the more tedious ones of speaking against time, as against hope" to delay the nomination which is certain to take place.⁵¹ On Tuesday, March 21, the *American* announced that the Senate had confirmed the mission to Panama and published the additional information that the data of the secret meetings of the Senate would soon be made public. The *American* was certain that after the documents of the Senate meetings had been examined that would be seen

that a great national measure has been sought to be defeated, not by argument, not by the evidence of its unfitness or dangerous tendency, but by schemes of procrastination, founded on the wish to pull down an adversary, and at any cost of honor or interest to the country, to depress an administration which, to say nothing of presumed merits, has not actually had the time to be tested—for good or for evil.⁵²

The Presidential Message to the House of Representatives, of March 15, elicited high praise from the *American*.

It is with unaffected pride as Americans that we present to our readers this evening the message of the President of the United States to the House of Representatives, asking appropriations for the Panama mission, and setting forth the grounds upon which he deemed it advisable to accept the invitation to send ministers to that Congress.

We have necessarily excluded much other matter, but the deep interest which has been given to this subject, arising as well from its intrinsic importance, as from the embittered and factious opposition to which it has given rise will, we think, serve as an apology.⁵³

Again, on Friday, March 24, the *American* editorialized at great length and in a most laudatory manner upon the Message of Adams to the House. The *American* expressed an anxiety to stress the worth of the Message because it had been mistaken in its attitude toward the Panama Congress when first United States' participation was proposed.⁵⁴ On Tuesday, March 28, the *American* reprinted, from the *Richmond Whig*, a long editorial which declared that the opposition to President Adams

⁵¹ *New York American*, Tuesday, March 7, 1826.

⁵² *New York American*, Tuesday, March 21, 1826.

⁵³ *New York American*, Tuesday, March 21, 1826.

⁵⁴ *New York American*, Friday, March 24, 1826.

with regard to the Panama question was simply "vindictive rancor" which had its beginnings the very day Adams assumed the Presidential office.⁵⁵ In April the editor of the *American* felt certain that the reading public of the United States was sick and tired of the Panama dispute.

There are hopes that the Panama discussion was brought to a close on Wednesday in the House of Representatives, and if ever a newspaper-reading people were tired of a topic, they are so of this. There is no doubt, the appropriation bill providing for the mission will pass by a large majority.

This article closes with a few critical jibes at the actions of the Senate and House of Representatives and terms some of the arguments used by the opposition in both Houses as "hash" and "stale matter."⁵⁶ The *American* maintained its critical tone toward Congress even after the passage of the appropriations bill by the House in April. In comment upon an article which had appeared in the *Albany Argus* stating that the ministers to Panama would sail from New York, on the Lexington, in late June, the *American* included a deft jab at Congress:

This we apprehend to be a mistake. The decision on the appointment was so long and injuriously delayed, that it would be now at the most extreme and unnecessary hazard of life that men from more northern climes should be dispatched to Panama, and we presume therefore that they will not go till the fall.⁵⁷

The *National Gazette* lauded the Message of Adams, and condemned the politicians in both Houses who led the opposition in its issue of Monday, March 20. In his issue of Tuesday, April 4, Walsh criticized the impropriety of publishing to the sight of all the world, the documents relative to Panama, demanded by

⁵⁵ *New York American*, Tuesday, March 28, 1826.

⁵⁶ *New York American*, Tuesday, April 25, 1826. Cf. same issue for reprint from the *National Journal*, "We may at length congratulate our readers on the termination of the discussion on the mission to Panama."

⁵⁷ *New York American*, Friday, May 26, 1826. Cf. *American*, Tuesday, May 2 for comment upon resolution introduced into Senate by Mr. Berrien of Georgia relative to Panama mission. The resolution was termed a delaying tactic which could not succeed.

Notes: On Tuesday, June 27, 1826, Charles King, who had been associated with Johnson Verplanck in the proprietorship and editorship of the *American*, became sole owner and editor. After that date the *American* published very few items relative to Panama. King seemingly was more interested in European news than in that of Latin America.

the Senate and the House. Walsh, insisted, further, that this impropriety only served to prove that the President should have the power to handle such matters personally as a normal function of the wide discretionary powers he should possess.⁵⁸ On Tuesday, April 18, the *Gazette* served notice on its readers that although papers hostile to the administration had been heaping praise on the opponents of the Panama mission, "the result for us is not the least change of opinion."⁵⁹ The following day, April 19, Walsh editorialized:

The presence of British and French agents, and a Brazilian plenipotentiary, by invitation, in the Congress of Panama, will give a character to that meeting, wholly different from that which it was meant and ought to have. It must become, from that circumstance, a scene for action, we might say, intrigue, for European interests and designs, as well as American. The Holy Alliance will be virtually, even doubly, represented there. We consider the government of Brazil as a part, or an instrument of that league. . . .

Some of our orators at Washington have expressed alarm at the idea of the perpetual duration and permanent authority of the Congress of Panama. They may lay aside their fears. This grand areopagus will either disappear, or lose all real control, soon after the termination of the war with Spain. Such an assembly cannot be endowed with the means of *coercion*, indispensable to procure obedience to its decisions or decrees. In Greece, and in Germany, the stronger States oppressed the weaker, the ambitious committed usurpations and broke through compacts, wars raged, and force prevailed, in spite of amphictyonic councils.⁶⁰

Despite his editorializing Walsh, like some of his contemporaries, was tired of the debate in late April and wrote, "The country is so much tired of the main question, that it would be content with almost any decisions of the House."⁶¹

After the passage of the appropriations bill which provided

⁵⁸ *National Gazette*, Tuesday, April 4, 1826.

⁵⁹ *National Gazette*, Tuesday, April 18, 1826.

⁶⁰ *National Gazette*, Wednesday, April 19, 1826.

⁶¹ *National Gazette*, Saturday, April 22, 1826. On Saturday, April 29, the *Gazette* printed the first portion of Daniel Webster's speech in the House on April 14. Walsh differed with Webster who had maintained that the President had not submitted "the expediency" of the mission to House. Walsh insisted that the language of the President was "unequivocal." The second portion of Webster's speech was published on Monday, May 1.

funds for the mission notices relative to Panama appeared in the newspapers much less frequently than during the months of February, March, and April. In early September the papers carried notices of the speech delivered by Don Manuel Lorenzo Vidaurre, Plenipotentiary from the Republic of Peru, at the opening session on June 22. Some of the papers published the full text of Vidaurre's speech. In late September reports were published that the scene of the Congressional meetings was to be changed from Panama to a town "near Mexico City," Tacubaya. During September, likewise, the death of Richard C. Anderson was reported and the papers paid him tribute. In late November the appointment of Joel Poinsett, as substitute for the deceased Anderson, was announced.

There was, however, in these latter months of the year 1826, some editorializing, pro and con, concerning the merits of United States participation. In its issue of Friday, November 10, the *Richmond Enquirer* reprinted an article captioned "Panama Mission" from the columns of the *Philadelphia Free Journal*.

We are inclined to think that this mission is one of the merest political farces, ever perpetrated before the people of the United States. It is a hollow juggling trick, and it is time we should open our eyes and view the objects of the concealed master spirits behind the scenes, who direct the movements of the puppets in front.

The writer then analyzed the origin, character, and current condition of the mission and concluded that we should have refrained from participation because of our tradition of no entangling alliances; that the President had no constitutional right to declare that we would participate; and lastly, the writer poses an inquiry as to the whereabouts of our ministers while the Congress was in session at Panama. In response to this inquiry, the answer is immediately forthcoming that the ministers were at home drawing their salaries.⁶² In the same issue of the *Enquirer* Ritchie and Gooch attack Gales and Seaton of the *National Intelligencer* for their pro-administration attitude during the months of discussion upon the Panama question.⁶³ A week later, Friday, November 17, the *Enquirer* again attacked the *National Intelligencer* for, among other things, its stand on the Panama

⁶² *Richmond Enquirer*, Friday, November 10, reprint from *Philadelphia Free. (Freemans) Journal*.

⁶³ *Richmond Enquirer*, Friday, November 10, 1826.

mission,⁶⁴ and on November 24, raised the question, once more, as to the whereabouts of the ministers to Panama in a reprint from the *New York Enquirer*.

We see in a London paper, the following:—"The Dartmoor frigate, from Jamaica, with the British minister from the Congress of Panama, arrived at Portsmouth, Oct. 12 h." [sic]

Where is the American minister to the Congress of Panama, about whom the nation was in a ferment last winter?

Is he about returning to the United States, or has he been engaged a whole year, in regulating the elections in Pennsylvania, instead of attending to the public business?⁶⁵

When President Adams, in his Message to Congress on Tuesday, December 5, 1826, declared it was expedient to send ministers to Panama the *Enquirer* made sharp and critical response in its issue of December 9.⁶⁶

Some of the advocates of participation commented with favor upon the meeting of the Congress, but, strange as it may seem, the *Enquirer* and opposition papers quoted, excepted, none manifested displeasure that our representatives were not present at the Panama meeting. In September, when the first substantial reports arrived from Panama the *National Intelligencer* congratulated the states of South America for having allied against a common enemy and believed that the King of Spain "will at length see how hopeless is the struggle to regain his authority over any portions of the countries of America."⁶⁷ The *Massachusetts Spy* reported the opening of the sessions in its issue of Wednesday, September 6 and opined:

Whatever might have been the opinions of men, while under the strong excitement growing out of party views, we can hardly believe there are many who, on cool deliberation, would be willing our country should be unrepresented there.⁶⁸

Walsh of the *National Gazette* had supported United States participation for he had felt there was no danger of entangling

⁶⁴ *Richmond Enquirer*, Friday, November 17, 1826.

⁶⁵ *Richmond Enquirer*, Friday, November 24, 1826. Reprint from the *New York Enquirer*. The minister referred to is apparently John B. Sergeant.

⁶⁶ *Richmond Enquirer*, Saturday, December 9, 1826.

⁶⁷ *National Intelligencer*, Friday, September 8, 1826.

⁶⁸ *Massachusetts Spy*, Wednesday, September 6, 1826.

alliances. Earlier in the year he had expressed the opinion that the Congress could not endure. Reports he received in December served only to confirm him in his belief.

When intelligence of the disorders in Colombia and the new plans of Bolivar reaches Mexico, it may have the effect of dissolving the Congress of Tucabaya. [sic]. While the governments, to which the members respectively belong, are declared to be in a state of dissolution, or undergoing fundamental, anti-republican changes, we know not with what degree or sense of due authority and alternate advantage, any compacts or arrangements can be made by that body.⁶⁹

In summary it can be said, without fear of contradiction, that President John Quincy Adams' proposal to accept the invitation to send delegates to the sessions of the Panama Congress did not go unnoticed by the Press. Sharp division manifested itself among the various editors, some were ardent in their support of the President, others were violent in their opposition. Some editors, originally in opposition to United States participation in the Panama meeting, swung over to a favorable attitude once they learned the full details of Adams' plan, that Adams did not intend to sacrifice our independence. The opponents of the administration harked back, time and again, to the warnings of Washington and Jefferson against entangling alliances. The supporters of Adams thought, and quite rightly, that the counsel of Washington and Jefferson did not apply with respect to South America. They argued that a new set of circumstances, wholly undreamed of by Washington, warranted our cooperation. South America was simply a vast colonial empire when Washington wrote, but in 1826 was comprised of several new, independent, self-sufficient, republican states.

In the early days of the controversy the anti-Adams forces challenged his constitutional right to announce his intention to accept the invitation to attend, but this argument soon lost force when the President submitted the matter to the House of Congress for confirmation and appropriations, respectively. Only the "no entangling alliance" argument remained as a valid argument for the anti-Panama group, but that, likewise, proved ineffective to forestall an administration victory in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Difference of opinion on a sectional basis is not evident from the papers consulted. The

⁶⁹ *National Gazette*, Thursday, December 14, 1826.

Yeoman of Worcester, Massachusetts, was chided by the *Massachusetts Spy* for its anti-Adams attitude. Hezekiah Niles of Baltimore was pro-Panama from the beginning to the end of the controversy. The *National Intelligencer* of Washington, the *National Gazette* of Philadelphia were pro-Panama once their editors learned that President Adams did not intend to sacrifice the neutrality and the independence of the United States. The *New York American* adopted a similar attitude while two Trenton, New Jersey, papers, the *True American* and the *Emporium*, opposed Adams in vigorous fashion. The writer will hazard the impression that the opposition was occasioned, in great part, not by the merits of the Panama question, but rather by animosity toward the administration of President John Quincy Adams.

The prolonged debates in the Senate and the House of Representatives caused the pro-Panama editors to adopt a critical attitude toward Congress. They felt that the Panama Mission, important though it was, was greatly overplayed and overemphasized in both Houses, that the extended wrangling had unnecessarily paralyzed legislative progress for weeks on end. Implicitly they declared that the opposition was making a mountain of a mole-hill in its desire to embarrass the administration. Lastly, some of the editors, at least, thought that the delaying tactics of the opposition had caused the reading public to lose interest in the whole question of Panama. If their readers were not, assuredly many of the editors were sick and tired of the subject by the end of April, 1826, but not so surfeited that they failed to report the details of the opening of the Panama Congress, the death of Richard Anderson, and the decision to change the locals of the Congress to Tacubaya, Mexico.

SELECT HISTORICAL READINGS IN ANCIENT HISTORY

BY DANIEL D. MCGARRY
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

The present bibliography is offered in the hope that it may be of some assistance to students and teachers of Ancient History and History of Civilization. It is especially adapted for use in collateral reading. Works listed have been selected on the basis of the likelihood of their being of interest to the *average* student of history. Hence only books of reasonable length, written in English, readable in style, and useful from some point of view—either as convenient surveys, reliable special treatments, or significant interpretations—are included. An effort is made to include both sides of problems. The History of Early Christianity is not treated in the present issue. Gratitude is expressed to Doctors Chauncey Finch, Robert Brockman, Thomas Brady, Prescott W. Townsend, and Edward Weltin of Saint Louis, Yale, Missouri, Indiana, and Washington Universities for looking over this bibliography. Further suggestions and comments will be welcome.

ANCIENT HISTORY PRELITERARY FOUNDATIONS

- Bakewell, Charles M., *Source Book in Ancient Philosophy*. N.Y., Scribners, 1907.
- Bishop, Carl W., et al, *Man From the Farthest Past*. N.Y., Smithsonian, 1930.
- Boaz, Franz, ed., *General Anthropology*. Boston, Heath, 1938.
- Burkitt, Miles C., *The Old Stone Age*, N.Y., Macmillan, 1933.
- Burkitt, Miles C., *Prehistory: . . . Early Cultures in Europe and the Mediterranean Basin*. Cambridge, University, 1921.
- Childe, Vere G., *The Bronze Age*. Cambridge, University, 1930.
- Childe, Vere G., *The Dawn of European Civilization*. N.Y., Knopf, 1925.
- Cledland, Herdman F., *Our Prehistoric Ancestors*. N.Y., Coward-McCann, 1928.
- Dawson, Christopher, *The Age of the Gods, . . . the Origins of Culture. . .* London, Sheed, 1933.
- Hawkes, Charles F., *The Prehistoric Foundations of Europe. . .* London, Methuen, 1940.
- Henderson, Keith, *Prehistoric Man*. London, Chatto, 1927.
- Hooton, Ernest A., *Up From the Ape*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1931.
- Hubert, Henri, *The Greatness and Decline of the Celts*, tr. M. Dobie, London, K. Paul, 1934.
- Hubert, Henri, *The Rise of the Celts*, tr. M. Dobie. London, K. Paul, 1934.
- Knight, Charles R., *Prehistoric Man*. N.Y., Appleton, 1949.
- Kroeger, Alfred L., *Anthropology. . .* N.Y., Harcourt, 1948.
- Dr. McGarry is Associate Professor of History at Saint Louis University.

- Lowie, Robert H., *Introduction to Cultural Anthropology*. N.Y., Farrar, 1940.
- Lowie, Robert H., *Primitive Society*. N.Y., Liveright, 1920.
- MacCurdy, George G., *Human Origins*. . . . 2 vols. N.Y., Appleton, 1924.
I. Old Stone Age. II. New Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages.
- Morgan, Jacques J. de, *Prehistoric Man*. . . . N.Y., Knopf, 1924.
- Muntch, Albert, *Cultural Anthropology*. N.Y., Bruce, 1934.
- Murray, Raymond W., *Man's Unknown Ancestors*. . . . Milwaukee, Bruce, 1943.
- Osborn, Henry F., *Men of the Old Stone Age*. . . . N.Y., Scribners, 1915.
- Parkyn, Ernest A., *Introduction to the Study of Prehistoric Art*. London, Longmans, 1915.
- Pittard, Eugene, *Race and History* . . . , tr. V. Collum. N.Y., Knopf, 1926.
- Renard, Georges, *Life and Work in Prehistoric Times*. N.Y., Knopf, 1929.
- Schmidt, Max, *The Primitive Races of Mankind*, tr. A. Dallas. London, Little Brown, 1927.
- Tyler, John M., *The New Stone Age in Northern Europe*. N.Y., Scribners, 1921.
- Wissler, Clark, *Introduction to Social Anthropology*. N.Y., Holt, 1929.
- Zacharias, Hans C., *Protohistory: . . . Human Thought. . . .* St. Louis, Herder, 1947.

Several worthwhile works on various phases of Ancient History are to be found in:

- The Loeb Classical Library*. London, Heinemanns. A series of Greek and Roman sources with English translations. Several are herein listed.
- Our Debt to Greece and Rome*, ed. G. Hadzits and D. Robinson. London, Harrap. A series of secondary works on Greek and Roman history. Some are listed.
- Pelican Books*. Harmondsworth, Eng., Penguin Books. A series dealing with Near Eastern as well as Greek and Roman History. A few are listed.

GENERAL ANCIENT HISTORY

- Breasted, James H., *The Conquest of Civilization*, ed. E. Ware. rev. N.Y., Harper, 1938.
- Brodeur, Arthur G., *The Pageant of Civilization*. N.Y., McBride, 1931.
- Burgh, William G. de, *The Legacy of the Ancient World*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1924.
- Caldwell, Wallace E., *The Ancient World*. N.Y., Rinehart, 1937.
- Cary, Max, and Haarhoff, T., *Life and Thought in the Greek and Roman World*. N.Y., Crowell, 1942.
- Cary, Max, and Warmington, E., *The Ancient Explorers*. N.Y., Dodd, 1929.
- Davis, William S., *Readings in Ancient History*. 2 vols. Boston, Allyn, 1912.
I. Greece and the East. II. Rome and the West.
- Fowler, William W., *The City-State of the Greeks and the Romans*. London, Macmillan, 1921.
- Fustel de Coulanges, Numa D., *The Ancient City . . . of Greece and Rome*, tr. W. Small. Boston, Lee & Shepard, 1901.
- Glover, Terrot R., *The Ancient World*. . . . N.Y., Macmillan, 1935.
- Halliday, William R., *The Growth of the City State . . . Greek and Roman* Liverpool, Hodder, 1923.

- Heitland, William E., *Agricola*, . . . *Agriculture and Rustic Life in the Greek and Roman World From the Point of View of Labor*. Cambridge, University, 1921.
- Maine, Henry J.S., *Ancient Law* . . . ed. F. Pollock. London, Oxford, 1931.
- Mayer, Frederick, *A History of Philosophy, Ancient and Medieval*. N.Y., American Book, 1950.
- Perkins, Clarence, *Ancient History*. London, Harper, 1936.
- Rostovzeff, Mikhail I., *A History of the Ancient World*, tr. J. D. Duff. Oxford, Clarendon, 1936-8. I. The Orient and Greece. II. Rome.
- Shepard, Arthur M., *Sea Power in Ancient History*. . . Boston, Little, 1924.
- Swain, Joseph W., *The Ancient World*. 2 vols. N.Y., Harper, 1950. I. Orient and Greece before 334 B.C. II. World Empires, Hellenistic and Roman.
- Taylor, Henry O., *Ancient Ideals*. . . 2 vols. N.Y., Macmillan, 1900. I. Oriental, Greek, Early Roman. II. High Roman, Hebrew, Christian.
- Toutain, Jules F., *The Economic Life of the Ancient World*, tr. M. Dobie. N.Y., Knopf, 1930.
- Treuer, Albert A., *History of Ancient Civilization*. 2 vols. N.Y., Harcourt, 1939. I. Near East and Greece. II. Roman World.
- Van Sickle, Clifton E., *A Political and Cultural History of the Ancient World*. 2 vols. Boston, Houghton, 1947-8. I. Greece and the East. II. Rome.
- Windelbrand, Wilhelm, *History of Ancient Philosophy*, tr. H. E. Cushman. N.Y., Scribners, 1899.

THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

- Baikie, James, *History of Egypt*. . . 2 vols. London, Black, 1929. I. The Old and Middle Kingdom. II. The New Empire.
- Baikie, James, *The Story of the Pharaohs*. London, Black, 1908.
- Bailey, Albert E., and Kent, C. F., *History of the Hebrew Commonwealth*. N.Y., Scribners, 1935.
- Bertholet, Alfred, *History of Hebrew Civilization*. N.Y., Brentano's, 1926.
- Bevan, Edwyn, and Singer, C., ed., *The Legacy of Israel*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1927.
- Breasted, James H., *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*. N.Y., Scribners, 1912.
- Breasted, James H., *A History of Egypt*. . . rev. N.Y., Scribners, 1950.
- Budge, E.A.W., *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians*. London, Dent, 1914.
- Caphart, Jean, *Egyptian Art*, tr. W. Dawson. N.Y., Stokes, n.d.
- Carleton, Patrick, *Buried Empires; the Earliest Civilizations of the Middle East*. N.Y., Dutton, 1939.
- Carter, Howard, and Mace, A., *The Tomb of Tut.Ankh.Amen*. . . 2 vols. N.Y., Doran, 1923.
- Chiera, Edward, and Cameron, G., *They Wrote on Clay*. . . Chicago, University, 1938. The Mesopotamians.
- Debevoise, Neilson C., *A Political History of Parthia*. Chicago, University, 1938.
- Delaporte, Louis J., *Mesopotamia; the Babylonian and Assyrian Civilization*, tr. V. Childe. N.Y., Knopf, 1925.

- Durant, Will, . . . *Our Oriental Heritage; a History of Civilization in Egypt, . . . the Near East, . . . India, China, and Japan*. N.Y., Simon & Schuster, 1935.
- Edwards, Iowerth E., *The Pyramids of Egypt*. Harmondsworth, Eng., Penguin, 1949.
- Erman, Adolf, *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians*. London, Methuen, 1927.
- Frankfort, Henri, *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man . . . in the . . . Near East*. Chicago, University, 1948.
- Hall, Harry R., *The Ancient History of the Near East . . . to the Battle of Salamis*. London, Methuen, 1950.
- Handcock, Percy S., *The Archaeology of the Holy Land*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1916.
- Handcock, Percy S., *Mesopotamian Archaeology*. . . N.Y., Putnams, 1912.
- Hitti, Philip K., *History of Syria, Including Lebanon and Palestine*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1951.
- Huart, Clement I., *Ancient Persia . . .*, tr. M. Dobie. N.Y., Knopf, 1927.
- Jastrow, Morris, Jr., *The Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*. . . Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1915.
- Jastrow, Morris, Jr., *Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions*. N.Y., Scribners, 1914.
- Kenyon, Frederic, *The Bible and Archaeology*. London, Harrap, 1940.
- King, Leonard W., *A History of Babylonia*. . . London, Chatto, 1919.
- King, Leonard W., *A History of Sumer and Akkad*. . . London, Chatto, 1910.
- The Legacy of Egypt*, ed. S. R. Glanville. Oxford, Clarendon, 1942.
- Mackenzie, Donald A., *Myths of Babylonia and Assyria*. London, Gresham, n.d.
- Maspero, Gaston C., *Manual of Egyptian Archaeology . . .*, tr. A. Edwards. rev. N.Y., Putnams, 1926.
- Moret, Alexandre, *In the Time of the Pharaohs*, tr. Mme. Moret. N.Y., Putnams, 1911.
- Moret, Alexandre, *The Nile and Egyptian Civilization*, tr. M. Dobie. N.Y., Knopf, 1927.
- Olmstead, Albert T., *History of Assyria*. N.Y., Scribners, 1923.
- Olmstead, Albert T., *History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest*. N.Y., Scribners, 1931.
- Olmstead, Albert T., *History of the Persian Empire*. Chicago, University, 1948. Achaemenid Period.
- The Old Testament*.
- Oursler, Fulton, *The Greatest Book Ever Written; the Old Testament Story*. Garden City, Doubleday, 1951.
- Peet, Thomas E., *A Comparative Study of the Literatures of Egypt, Palestine, and Mesopotamia*. London, Oxford, 1931.
- Pritchard, James B., ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, University, 1950. Texts are translated.
- Ragozin, Zenaide A., *The Story of Media, Babylon, and Persia*. N.Y., Putnams, 1888.

- Rawlinson, George, *History of Phoenicia*. London, Longmans, 1889.
- Rogers, Robert W., *A History of Ancient Persia*. N.Y., Scribners, 1929.
- Rogers, Robert W., *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*. 2 vols. N.Y., Abingdon, 1915.
- Ross, E. Denison, ed., *The Art of Egypt*. . . . N.Y., Rudge, 1931.
- Sayce, Archibald H., *The Hittites . . . a Forgotten Empire*. London, Religious Tract, 1925.
- Smith, Sidney, *Early History of Assyria*. . . London, Chatto, 1928.
- Smith, Henry P., *The Religion of Israel: an Historical Study*. N.Y., Scribners, 1928.
- Steindorff, George, and Seele, K.C., *When Egypt Ruled the East*. Chicago, University, 1942.
- Weigall, Arthur E.P., *The Life and Times of Akhnaton*. Edinburgh, Blackwood, 1911.
- Wilson, John A., *The Burden of Egypt: An Interpretation of Ancient Egyptian Culture*. Chicago, University, 1951.
- Wooley, Charles L., *The Sumerians*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1928.
- Wooley, Charles L., *Ur of the Chaldees*. London, Benn, 1920. Also Pelican.

THE ANCIENT GREEKS

- Abbott, Evelyn, *Pericles and the Golden Age of Athens*. N.Y., Putnams, 1908.
- Agard, Walter R., *What Democracy Meant to the Greeks*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina, 1942.
- Anderson, William J., *Architecture of the Ancient Greeks*, rev. W. Dinsmoor. London, Batsford, 1927.
- Baikie, James, *The Sea-Kings of Crete*. London, Black, 1920.
- Bevan, Edwyn R., *Egypt Under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*. London, Methuen, 1927.
- Bevan, Edwyn R., *The House of Seleucus*. 2 vols. London, Arnold, 1902.
- Bieber, Margarete, *History of the Greek and Roman Theater*. Princeton, University, 1939.
- Bonner, Robert J., *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*. Berkeley, University of California, 1933.
- Botsford, George W., *Hellenic History*, rev. by C. Robinson, Jr. N.Y., Macmillan, 1939.
- Bowra, Cecil M., *Ancient Greek Literature*. London, Oxford University, 1948.
- Burn, Andrew R., *Minoans, Philistines, and Greeks, B.C. 1400-900*. N.Y., Knopf, 1930.
- Bury, John B., *The Ancient Greek Historians*. London, Macmillan, 1909.
- Bury, John B., *History of Greece to the Death of Alexander*. . . London, Macmillan, 1931.
- Cary, Max, *A History of the Greek World From 323 to 146 B. C.* London, Methuen, 1939.
- Cochrane, Charles N., *Thucydides and the Science of History*. London, Oxford, 1929.

- Cooper, Lane, ed., *Fifteen Greek Plays*. . . . N.Y., Oxford, 1943.
- Cooper, Lane, ed., *Greek Genius and Its Influence*. . . . New Haven, Yale, 1917.
- Couch, Herbert N., *Greece*. . . . N.Y., Prentice Hall, 1940.
- Croiset, Alfred and Maurice, *Abridged History of Greek Literature*, tr. G. Heffelbower, N.Y., Macmillan, 1904.
- Croiset, Maurice, *Hellenic Civilization* . . . , tr. P. Thomas. N.Y., Knopf, 1925.
- Cummings, Lewis V., *Alexander the Great*. Boston, Houghton, 1940.
- Davidson, Thomas, *The Education of the Greek People and Its Influence on Civilization*. N.Y., Appleton, 1903.
- Davis, William S., *A Day in Old Athens* . . . Boston, Allyn, 1914.
- Dickinson, Goldsworthy L., *The Greek View of Life*. N.Y., Odyssey, 1941.
- Dinsmoor, William B., *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*. London, Batsford, 1950.
- Dunbabin, Thomas J., *The Western Greeks: . . . Sicily and South Italy . . . to 480 B.C.* Oxford, Clarendon, 1948.
- Durant, William, *The Life of Greece*. N.Y., Simon & Schuster, 1939.
- Farnell, Lewis R., *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1921.
- Ferguson, William S., *Greek Imperialism*. Boston, Houghton, 1913.
- Flickinger, Roy C., *The Greek Theater and Its Drama*. Chicago, University, 1926.
- Fowler, Harold N., Wheeler, J.R., and Stevens, A.P., *Handbook of Greek Archaeology*. Cincinnati, American Book, 1909.
- Freeman, Kenneth J., *Schools of Hellas . . . Practice and Theory* . . . London, Macmillan, 1908.
- Gardiner, Edward N., *Athletics of the Ancient World*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1930.
- Gardner, Percy, *Principles of Greek Art*. London, Macmillan, 1914.
- Glotz, Gustave, *The Aegean Civilization*. N.Y., Knopf, 1925.
- Glotz, Gustave, *The Ancient Greece at Work*. N.Y., Knopf, 1926.
- Glotz, Gustave, *The Greek City and Its Influence*. N.Y., Knopf, 1930.
- Glover, Terrot R., *From Pericles to Philip*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1917.
- Greek Historical Thought*, ed. and tr. A. J. Toynbee. Boston, Beacon, 1950.
- Greek Literature: a Series of Lectures*. . . . N.Y., Columbia University, 1912.
- Greene, William C., *The Achievement of Greece*. . . . Cambridge, Harvard, 1923.
- Greenidge, Abel H., *Handbook of Greek Constitutional History*. London, Macmillan, 1896.
- Grundy, George B., *The Great Persian War*. . . . London, Murray, 1901.
- Gulick, Charles B., . . . *Life of the Ancient Greeks*. . . . N.Y., Appleton, 1905.
- Guthrie, William K., *The Greeks and Their Gods*. London, Methuen, 1950.
- Hall, Harry R., *The Civilization of Greece in the Bronze Age*. London, Methuen, 1928.
- Heidel, William A., *The Heroic Age of Science*. . . . Baltimore, Williams, 1933.

- Henderson, Bernard W., *The Great War Between Athens and Sparta*. . . . London, Macmillan, 1926.
- Herodotus, *History*, tr. J. Powell. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon, 1949. Other trs.
- Hicks, Robert D., . . . *Stoic and Epicurean*. N.Y., Scribners, 1910.
- Hogarth, David G., *Philip and Alexander of Macedon*. . . . N.Y., Scribners, 1897.
- Homer, *The Iliad*, tr. A. Murphy. 2 vols. London, Heinemann, 1924-5. Other trs.
- Homer, *The Odyssey*, tr. S. Butcher and A. Lang. London, Modern, 1929.
- Howe, George, and Harrar, Gustave, eds., *Greek Literature in Translation*. rev. N. Y., Harper, 1948.
- Hyde, Walter W., *Ancient Greek Mariners*. N.Y., Oxford, 1947.
- James, Henry R., *Our Hellenic Heritage*. 2 vols. in 1. London, Macmillan, 1924.
- Jouget, Pierre, *Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East*. N.Y., Knopf, 1928.
- Laistner, Max L., *A History of the Greek World from 479 to 323 B.C.* London, Methuen, 1948.
- Lavell, Cecil F., *A Biography of the Greek People*. Boston, Houghton, 1934.
- Lawrence, Arnold W., *Classical Sculpture*. London, Cape, 1929.
- Livingstone, Richard W., *The Greek Genius and Its Meaning to Us*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1912.
- Livingstone, Richard W., ed., *The Legacy of Greece*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1922.
- Livingstone, Richard W., ed., *The Pageant of Greece*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1935.
- Ludwig, Emil, *Schleimann* . . . , tr. D. Tait. Boston, Little, 1931.
- MacIver, David Randall, *Greek City-States in Italy and Sicily*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1931.
- Mahaffy, John P., . . . *Alexander's Empire*. N.Y., Putnams, 1898.
- Mahaffy, John P., *The Empire of the Ptolemies*. N.Y. Macmillan, 1895.
- Mahaffy, John P., *Greek Life and Thought From the Age of Alexander*. . . . N.Y., Macmillan, 1887.
- Mahaffy, John P., *Old Greek Education*. N.Y., Harper, 1882.
- Miller, Walter, *Greece and the Greeks* . . . *Greek Civilization*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1924.
- Moore, Clifford H., *The Religious Thought of the Greeks*. Cambridge, Harvard, 1925.
- Murray, Gilbert, *Rise of the Greek Epic*. . . . rev. Oxford, 1924.
- Myres, John L., *Political Ideas of the Greeks*. . . . Cincinnati, Abingdon, 1927.
- Nilsson, Martin P., *History of Greek Religion*, tr. F. Fielden. Oxford, Clarendon, 1925.
- The Oxford Book of Greek Verse*, ed. T. Higham and C. Bowra. Oxford, Clarendon, 1931.
- Pickard-Cambridge, Arthur W., *Demosthenes*. . . . N.Y., Putnams, 1914.
- Plato, *The Republic*, tr. B. Jowett. N.Y., Heritage, 1944. Other trs.
- Plutarch, *Lives* . . . , tr. John Dryden. rev. A. Clough. N.Y., Modern, 1932. Other trs.

- Prentice, William K., *The Ancient Greeks: Studies*. . . . London, Milford, 1940.
- Reymond, Arnold, *History of the Sciences in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, tr. R.G. de Bray. London, Methuen, 1927.
- Ridder, Andre H.P.de and W. Deonna, *Art in Greece*. London, K. Paul, 1927.
- Robin, Leon, *Greek Thought and the Origins of the Scientific Spirit*. N.Y., Knopf, 1928.
- Robinson, Charles A., *Alexander the Great*. . . . N.Y., Dutton, 1947.
- Robinson, Cyril E., *A History of Greece*. London, Methuen, 1929.
- Rose, Herbert J., *Ancient Greek Religion*. London Hutchinson, 1946.
- Ross, William D., *Aristotle*. London, Methuen, 1949.
- Rostovtzeff, Mikhail I., *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. 3 vols. Oxford, Clarendon, 1941.
- Seymour, Thomas D., *Life in the Homeric Age*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1914.
- Stace, Walter T., *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy*. London, Macmillan, 1941.
- Stobart, John C., *The Glory That Was Greece*. . . . London, Sidgwick, 1921.
- Tarbell, Frank B., *History of Greek Art*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1899.
- Tarn, William W., *Alexander the Great*. 2 vols. Cambridge, University, 1948.
- Tarn, William W., *Hellenistic Civilization*. London, Arnold, 1927.
- Thucydides, . . . *The Peloponnesian War*, tr. R. Crawley. N.Y., Random, 1934. Other trs.
- Van Hook, Larue, *Greek Life and Thought*. . . . N.Y., Columbia U., 1923.
- Vinogradoff, P., *Jurisprudence of the Greek City*. Oxford, Milford, 1922.
- Warbeke, John M., *The Searching Mind of Greece*. N.Y., Crofts, 1930.
- Woodhouse, William J., *Solon the Liberator . . . the Agrarian Problem in Attika*. London, Oxford, 1938.
- Zeller, Eduard, *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*. rev. W. Nestle. Tr. L. Palmer. London, Routledge, 1950.
- Zimmern, Alfred, *The Greek Commonwealth*. . . . London, Oxford, 1944.

THE ANCIENT ROMANS

- Abbott, Frank F., *The Common People of Ancient Rome*. . . . N. Y., Scribners, 1911.
- Adcock, Frank E., *The Roman Art of War Under the Republic*. Cambridge, Harvard, 1940.
- Altheim, Franz, *A History of Roman Religion*, tr. H. Mattingly. London, Methuen, 1938.
- Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum Gestarum*. . . , with Eng. tr. by J. C. Rolfe. 3 vols. London, Heinemann, 1935-1939.
- Amos, Sheldon, *The History and Principles of the Civil Law of Rome*. London, K. Paul, 1883.
- Anderson, William J., and Spiers, R.P., *Architecture of Ancient Rome*. . . . rev. London, Botsford, 1927.
- Arnold, Edward V., *Roman Stoicism*. . . . Cambridge, University, 1911.

- Arnold, William T., *The Roman System of Provincial Administration*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1914.
- Bailey, Cyril, ed., *The Legacy of Rome*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1923.
- Bailey, Cyril, ed., *The Mind of Rome*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1926.
- Baker, George P., *Twelve Centuries of Rome (763 B.C.-A.D. 476)*. London, Bell, 1936.
- Boak, Arthur E.R., *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* N.Y., Macmillan, 1921.
- Botsford, George W., *The Roman Assemblies*. . . . N.Y., Macmillan, 1909.
- Bouchier, Edmund S., *Syria as a Roman Province*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1916.
- Buchan, John, *Augustus*. Boston, Houghton, 1937.
- Bury, John B., . . . *History of the Roman Empire . . . (27 B.C.-180 A.D.)*. N.Y., American, 1907.
- Carcopino, Jerome, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, tr. E. Lorimer. New Haven, Yale, 1940.
- Carter, Jesse B., *The Religious Life of Ancient Rome*. . . . Boston, Houghton, 1911.
- Chapot, Victor, *The Roman World*. N.Y., Knopf, 1928.
- Charlesworth, Martin P., *Five Men: Character Studies From the Roman Empire*. Cambridge, Harvard, 1936.
- Charlesworth, Martin P., *Trade Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire*. rev. Cambridge, University, 1926.
- Cicero, Marcus T., *Orations*, tr. C. D. Yonge. N.Y., Colonial, 1900. Other trs.
- Cowell, Frank R., *Cicero and the Roman Republic*. . . . N.Y., Canticleer, 1948.
- Davis, William S., *A Day in Old Rome*. Boston, Allyn, 1942.
- Declareuil, Joseph, *Rome the Law-Giver*. N.Y., Knopf, 1927.
- Dill, Samuel, *Roman Society From Nero to Marcus Aurelius*. London, Macmillan, 1904.
- Dill, Samuel, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*. rev. London, Macmillan, 1906.
- Dodge, Theodore A., . . . *Caesar; a History of the Art of War Among the Romans*. Boston, Houghton, 1893.
- Duff, John W., *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*. . . . N.Y., Scribners, 1927.
- Duff, John W., *A Literary History of Rome . . . to the Close of the Golden Age*. N.Y., Scribners, 1932.
- Durant, Will, *Caesar and Christ: A History of Roman Civilization and Christianity . . . to A.D. 325*. N.Y., Simon, 1944.
- Fell, Roland A., *Etruria and Rome*. Cambridge, University, 1924.
- Ferrero, Guglielmo, *Characters and Events of Roman History From Caesar to Nero*, tr. F. Ferrero. N.Y., Putnams, 1909.
- Ferrero, Guglielmo, *The Life of Caesar*, tr. A. Zimmern. London, Allen, 1933.
- Ferrero, Guglielmo, *The Ruin of Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity*, tr. Lady Whitehead. N.Y., Putnams, 1921.

- Fowler, William W., *Julius Caesar and the Foundation of the Roman Imperial System*. N.Y., Putnams, 1919.
- Fowler, William W., *The Religious Experience of the Roman People . . . to the Age of Augustus*. London, Macmillan, 1933.
- Frank, Tenney, *An Economic History of Rome*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, 1927.
- Frank, Tenney, *A History of Rome*. N.Y., Holt, 1923.
- Frank, Tenney, *Roman Imperialism*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1921.
- Geer, Russel M., *Rome*, in *Classical Civilization* by Couch and Geer. N.Y., Prentice, 1940.
- Greene, William C., *The Achievement of Rome . . .* Cambridge, Harvard, 1933.
- Greenidge, Abel H., *The Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1901.
- Grenier, Albert, *The Roman Spirit*. . . . N.Y., Knopf, 1926.
- Gwynn, Aubrey O., *Roman Education*. . . . Oxford, Clarendon, 1926.
- Halliday, William R., *Lectures on the History of Roman Religion*. . . . Liverpool, University, 1923.
- Hammond, Mason, *The Augustan Principate* . . . Cambridge, Harvard, 1933.
- Henderson, Bernard W., *Five Roman Emperors*. . . . Cambridge, University, 1927.
- Henderson, Bernard W., . . . *Emperor Hadrian*. . . . London, Methuen, 1923.
- Heitland, William E., *Short History of the Roman Republic*. Cambridge, University, 1911.
- Holsapple, Lloyd B., *Constantine the Great*. . . . N.Y., Sheed, 1942.
- Homo, Leon, *Primitive Italy and the Beginnings of Roman Imperialism*, tr. V. Childe. London, K. Paul, 1926.
- Homo, Leon, *Roman Political Institutions From City to State*, tr. M. Dobie. London, K. Paul, 1930.
- Jones, Henry S., *The Roman Empire, B.C. 29 to A.D. 476*. London, Putnams, 1908.
- Laistner, Max L., *The Greater Roman Historians*. Berkeley, California, 1947.
- The Latin Poets*, ed. F. Godolphin. N.Y., Modern, 1949.
- Launspach, Charles W., *State and Family in Early Rome*. London, Bell, 1908.
- Livy, Titus, *Roman History*, tr. J. Freese et al. N.Y., Appleton, 1899. Other trs.
- Louis, Paul, *Ancient Rome at Work*. . . . N.Y., Knopf, 1927.
- Mackail, John W., *Latin Literature*. N.Y., Scribners, 1923.
- Marsh, Frank B., *Founding of the Roman Empire*. Austin, University, 1927.
- Marsh, Frank B., *History of the Roman World . . . 146 to 30 B.C.* London, Methuen, 1935.
- Marsh, Frank B., *The Reign of Tiberius*. London, Oxford, 1931.
- Mommsen, Theodor, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*. . . . , tr. W. Dickson. 2 vols. N.Y., Scribners, 1906.
- Moore, Frank G., *The Roman's World*, N.Y., Columbia, 1936.
- Morey, William C., *Outlines of Roman Law*. N.Y., Putnams, 1914.

- Oman, Charles W., *Seven Roman Statesmen*. . . . London, Arnold, 1902.
- Parker, Henry M., *History of the Roman World from A.D. 138 to 337*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1935.
- Parker, Henry M., *The Roman Legions*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1928.
- Peet, Thomas E., *The Stone and Bronze Age in Italy and Sicily*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1909.
- Plutarch, *Lives* . . . , tr. J. Dryden. rev. A. Clough, N.Y., Modern, 1927. Other trs.
- Quintilian, Marcus F., *Quintilian on Education* . . . , ed. and tr. W. Smail. Oxford, Clarendon, 1938.
- Rand, Edward K., *The Building of Eternal Rome*. Cambridge, Harvard, 1943.
- Randall-MacIver, David, *Italy Before the Romans*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1928.
- Reid, James S., *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge, University, 1913.
- Robinson, Cyril E., *A History of Rome . . . 753 B.C. to A.D. 410*. N.Y., Crowell, 1935.
- Rose, Herbert J., *Ancient Roman Religion*. London, Hutchinson, 1948.
- Rostovtzeff, Mikhail I., *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1926.
- Soullard, Howard H., *History of the Roman World . . . 753 to 146 B.C.* N.Y., Macmillan, 1939.
- Soullard, Howard H., *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.* Oxford, Clarendon, 1951.
- Showerman, Grant, *Rome and the Romans*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1931.
- Stevenson, George H., *Roman Provincial Administration*. . . N.Y., Stechert, 1939.
- Suetonius Tranquilius, C., *Lives* . . . , tr. J. Rolfe. 2 vols. London, Heinemann, 1914-20.
- Strong, Eugenie, . . . *Art in Ancient Rome*. 2 vols. N.Y., Scribners, 1928.
- Syme, Donald, *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1939.
- Tacitus, Cais C., *Histories*, tr. C. Moore, and *Annals*, tr. J. Jackson. 4 vols. Cambridge, Harvard, 1937.
- Taylor, Hannis, *Cicero: . . . His Life and Works*. Chicago, McClurg, 1918.
- Taylor, Lily Ross, *Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown, Am. Phil. As., 1931.
- Taylor, Lily Ross, *Party Politics in the Age of Cicero*. Berkeley, U. of California, 1949.
- Vergilius Maro, P., *Aeneid*, tr. J. Dryden. N.Y., Heritage, 1944. Other trs.
- Walter, Gerard, *Caesar* . . . , tr. E. Crauford. N.Y., Scribners, 1952.
- Walters, Henry B., *The Art of the Romans*. London, Methuen, 1928.
- Whatmough, Joshua, *The Foundations of Roman Italy*. London, Methuen, 1937.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

MEDIEVAL

Margaret of Metola, by William R. Bonniwell, O.P. Kenedy & Sons. New York. 1952. pp. 177. \$2.50.

Feudalism, by F. L. Ganshof. Trans. by Philip Grierson. Longmans. 1952. pp. 160. \$3.25.

Margaret of Metola is the story of a very unusual saint. Fr. Bonniwell has already edited a critical edition of the long lost manuscript which forms the basis for this more popular version. Margaret had the misfortune to be born to a father and mother (small-time Italian Renaissance nobility), who desperately wanted a boy. Not only was the baby a girl, but she was horribly deformed. And she was totally blind. Imprisoned for years to "save face" for her parents, Margaret was finally abandoned by her parents after they had brought her secretly to another town and to an unfamiliar church. Years of prayer and quiet resignation had already brought the 17-year-old girl far along the road of sanctity and the remaining years left to her (she died at 33) only increased her spiritual growth. This biography rests on solid scholarship and presents to the history student another side of that turbulent fourteenth-century Italian Renaissance, so easy to over-simplify and so difficult to evaluate.

In the English translation of Professor Ganshof's synthetic explanation of *Feudalism*, teachers of survey and upper-division medieval history courses have an excellent teaching aid. Joining to his native gift of clarity a profound knowledge of the existing source materials, the author presents a simple exposition of the various aspects of Feudalism as found in "the regions lying between the Loire and the Rhine, which were the heart of the Carolingian estate and the original home of feudalism." The treatise takes up the origins, the Carolingian type, and the Classical Age of Feudalism, and explains by the use of original texts (given both in the original and in translation) the ceremonies and institutions peculiar to feudalism. A wealth of footnotes offer to the reader the possibility of further researches into the primary sources. There is one serious drawback to the book in its present format—there is no index. In a book crammed with feudal terminology that is a very serious drawback indeed.

The book "deals less fully with England and scarcely at all with Italy" and the author "intends to deal with feudalism only in the narrow, technical, legal sense of the word." It was about time somebody dealt with it in just that sense and gave us a clear, scholarly synthesis of the basic concepts of the institution. Prof. Ganshof has done just that.

L. J. Daly, Saint Louis University.

Medieval Art, by W. B. Lethaby, rev. by D. Talbot Rice. New York. Philosophical Library. 1950. pp. 223. \$7.50.

The author has covered a wide period from 312 A.D. to 1350 A.D. He traces the progress of architecture and the allied arts from the time of Constantine to the eve of the Renaissance and weaves a crisp and interesting account of the intricate developments of art and architecture during these many centuries. Throughout this exposition the author describes the various churches or buildings that exemplify the characteristics prevalent in that period or indigenous to that district.

From the start, Lethaby wishes to stress the influence of the East, especially of the Byzantine world, on the art and architecture of the West. And so throughout, as the history unfolds itself, the reader is reminded of this influence even in the Romanesque and Gothic styles.

Over half the content of the book is devoted to the development of Gothic art, especially that in France. With reason, the author ascribes the full development and fruition of Gothic to France, but at times is a bit too severe on the English development of Gothic. It is in these chapters dealing with Gothic that one senses the enthusiasm and feeling of the author, when he strives to describe by mere words these creations in stone.

The recent book, a standard work for almost half a century, has been reworked to include the new material and discoveries that have become available through the years. This revision has been accomplished by Professor Talbot Rice. On account of the large volume of new information that has become available, at times considerable changes in the original text have been considered necessary. In other places the new material is simply indicated in the notes.

The selection of illustrations is naturally new and different both because of the amount of new material now at hand and

because of the great advances in photography during the years since the work was first published.

This revised edition, retaining the originality and enthusiasm of Lethaby, together with the 80 new halftones and numerous drawings make the book a worthwhile addition to any library.

Gregory H. Jacobsmeyer, Saint Louis University.

Egypt and the Roman Empire, by Allan C. Johnson. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press. 1951. pp. viii, 183. \$3.50.

The chapters in this little volume are the Jerome Lectures of 1947 given at the University of Michigan. Professor Johnson is a specialist on Roman Egypt and this work will be welcomed by specialists. The sands and ruins of Egypt are literally a mine of information for those interested in the social and economic history of the Roman empire. "Finds" are always being made and it is necessary from time to time to integrate the new evidence into the growing body of scholarship. The student who uses the volumes of Rostovtzeff and Tenney Frank will find it useful to work with Johnson at his elbow. To this reviewer, the first two chapters on fiduciary currency and inflation are the most valuable. Recent historical experience as well as a growing knowledge of the economics of money, banking, and public finance make the present-day student more appreciative of (and interested in) such problems and events.

Richard L. Porter, Saint Louis University.

Innocent III, Church Defender, by Charles Edward Smith. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1951. pp. vi, 203. \$3.50.

The author, head of the History Department of Louisiana State University, makes a scholarly, well conceived contribution to our knowledge of Innocent III, whose administration marks the apogee of the mediæval papacy. Dr. Smith does not endeavor to give a full account of Innocent's life, nor does he retrace the outlines of previous scholarship. Rather he concentrates on cases which illustrate the operation of Innocent's untiring concern for the welfare of the Church. In this, his primary source is the correspondence of the great Pope to be found in Migne's *Patrologiæ . . . series latina*, volumes CCXIV to CCXVII. The work thus comprises an interesting summary of cases illustrating Innocent's repression of violence against clerics, his protection of the prop-

erty and privileges of the Church, his insistence on canonical safeguards relative to ecclesiastical elections and appointments, the observance of impediments to office, and the prevention of prolongation of vacancies for selfish purposes, his vigilance to eliminate any species of simony, as well as to repress pluralism, absenteeism, and clerical incontinence, and his promotion of monastic reform. Smith illustrates, again by select examples, Innocent's unflagging concern for the Church in Hungary, Poland, and Bulgaria, as recently converted border areas, critical in relations with both Byzantium and Islam, as well as his patient tact with truculent rulers in these parts. The work concludes with the somewhat pitiable story of Innocent's persistent but vain efforts to organize and set in motion a true and successful crusade for the recovery of the holy places. As we read the work the stature of Innocent III as a churchman grows, and we see him portrayed by his own writings and acts, with the aid of an understanding scholar, as a true shepherd, inspired primarily by spiritual values, ever ready to temper justice with charity, provided that such could be done without jeopardizing the welfare of souls.

Daniel D. McGarry, Saint Louis University.

Medieval Skepticism and Chaucer, by Mary Edith Thomas. New York. The William-Frederick Press. 1950. pp. 184. \$3.00.

It is unfortunate that students still feel perfectly justified in offering a presumably scholarly analysis of the Middle Ages, and even as specifically philosophical and theological an element of that period as skepticism, while confessing and showing themselves ignorant both of scholastic philosophy and of the doctrines of the Church. Surely, a medievalist who does not wish to rival the Soviet history of "beisbol" in America must know the thought and belief of the age he studies.

It is basic philosophical and theological confusion which prevents this book from being a helpful analysis of skepticism in Chaucer, either historically or artistically.

The historical essay which forms the first part of the book is simply a very superficial repetition of the late Professor Coulton's theories, text by text. The latter part of the book is a puzzling treatment of some of Chaucer's comments on belief and knowledge. It is puzzling because the author seems to know Chaucer and to concur heartily in the better scholarly view that Chaucer was basically a believing and devout Catholic. From

this position she goes on to "demonstrate" by a few texts superficially interpreted, Chaucer's "skepticism," which is evidently the theme of the study. Thus, if skepticism is taken rigidly and theologically, Chaucer could not be a Catholic; if philosophically, he could not be consistent. But, in fact, what "skepticism" seems to mean in this book is any kind of exercise of thought on problems of the Faith; of this kind of "skepticism" there was fortunately plenty in any century of the Middle Ages. It is this confusion which destroys the value of the book as a study of skepticism. In interpreting a text of Chaucer, any degree or facet of thought from purely dramatic portrayal of faithlessness to full-blown philosophical skepticism is facilely labeled "skepticism" and woven into the Coulton pattern. The medieval poets, preachers, philosophers, and mere thinkers were a considerably more complex and agile set of thinkers than this.

Leonard A. Waters, Saint Louis University.

Monastic Sites from the Air, by David Knowles and J.K.S.St. Joseph. Cambridge. 1952. xxvii, 130 plates, pp. 282. \$11.00.

This novel presentation of English monastic history should be of use to every teacher of medieval history courses either of the college-survey or upper division type. The book contains 130 air-photographs taken with the cooperation of the RAF of the present state of English monasteries. Each plate is accompanied by a brief explanation and some historical notes on the monastery, while the work is prefaced by a scholarly and clear exposition of the general principles governing monastic architecture. The photographs are the work of Dr. St. Joseph and the scholarly notes and the excellent exposition of the general principles governing monastic architecture are from the pen of David Knowles whose authority on matters of English medieval monasticism is unique.

The average student can gain from even the most cursory perusal a vivid realization of the vastness of the monastic establishments which dotted the English landscapes before the Great Steal. The page-after-page illustration of these great monastic buildings gives him a "new sense of the genius for order and beauty of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries," but the portrayal of so many stark skeletons of architecture also reminds one, forcibly, of the shallow, selfish greed that brought about their ruin.

L. J. Daly, Saint Louis University.

MODERN

The English Catholics, 1850-1950, edited by the Right Reverend George Andrew Beck. London. Burns Oates. 1950. pp. xix, 640. \$6.50.

This collection of studies on the growth of the Church in England since the reestablishment of the hierarchy there a century ago was undertaken by Bishop Beck at the request of the English hierarchy. The result is a series of excellent studies on nineteen subjects falling under that general heading. Some essays are by eminently well known English Catholic historians, like Philip Hughes and David Mathew, and others are by relatively obscure men. But they are uniformly solid pieces of work dealing with such subjects as problems of education, Irish immigration, the Catholic press, and the development of the religious orders. The only person to be treated individually is Cardinal Newman, who is the subject of an essay.

This work does not pretend to be a history of the Church in England in the last century. It is simply a series of studies on English Catholics since 1850. As such, it is an excellent piece of work.

Thomas P. Neill, Saint Louis University.

Britain and the Dominions, by W. R. Brock. Cambridge. University Press. 1951. pp. xxi, 521. \$2.50.

This volume is the first in a series devoted to the history of the British Commonwealth and Empire. Subsequent volumes are to deal with individual countries within the Commonwealth; accordingly the present volume deals less fully with the internal history of these countries. But this volume is more than a general introduction; it is the story of the transition from empire and colony to the equality of commonwealth. Within his self-imposed limits, the author has been, on the whole, quite successful in developing his theme.

The book is a text book, designed for "young students," which last must surely mean a group of 17 to 19 year olds. As a text, it suffers many of the ills that texts are heir to, e.g. oversimplification, broad generalizations. "The generosity of the Quebec Act" (1774) p. 133, seems to imply a somewhat unctuous tribute to the

enlightened liberalism of the British government; these words should be read along with the instructions given in January 1775, to Sir Guy Carleton by that same government: "... always remembering that it is a toleration of the free exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome only, to which they are entitled." (Short & Doughty, *Constitutional Documents*, p. 602). There follows a lengthy list of restrictions on the "free exercise" of the Catholic religion. If these restrictions were by and large not applied, it was due to the governors who ignored their instructions.

However, the volume is very useful for the high-school library and teacher, and may well serve the purpose of a rapid review for the college student. It is well printed with many simple and clear maps and diagrams.

J. E. Healey, Loyola College, Montreal.

The Soviet State at Its Inception, by Harry Best. New York. The Philosophical Library. 1950. pp. 437. \$6.00.

The author of *The Soviet State* is a professor of sociology at the University of Kentucky and in his field has published volumes dealing with the deaf and the blind and on American criminal law. In 1941 Professor Best wrote his first book outside his established orbit, namely, *The Soviet Experiment*, and although there is no apparent reference to this previous work in it, the current book is essentially a re-working and elaboration under a different publisher of the former volume. In fact, in several chapters the reader will find identical phraseology, line for line, or else a simple re-casting of the original phrasing from the 1941 publication.

Professor Best writes as a sociologist attempting to reach some sort of assessment of the Soviet state and its institutions, explaining in general terms the genesis of the system, and how it works. Clearly, in this task it is not the author's intention either to present any really new particulars or to make any startlingly different analysis of what is surely the most challenging international problem the United States has ever faced—that of Soviet expansionism. In short, Professor Best has undertaken what he calls a "sociological appraisal," presumably aimed at an audience including the average college student and the intelligent "man in the street."

Judged by these standards *The Soviet State* succeeds. For the reader who has had little knowledge of things Russian the work presents in extremely broad terms (121 pages) the salient facts of Russian geography, history and government, and then plunges into a general picture of Soviet life since 1917. This last is broken down into individual chapters on various phases of Soviet social organization, and finally provides an over-all estimate of what the Bolshevik state may have achieved and an evaluation thereof.

In no sense does this book command much interest from the "expert" in the field. The historian, for example, will discover sundry factual errors, or at best, misleading statements. To mention a few, no map will show the ancient Anatolian kingdom of Pontus "in the Crimean region by the Sea of Azov;" the generals of Genghis Khan advanced much further West than the Volga, in fact, as far as Silesia; Novgorod is located not on the upper Volga but on the Volkhov; there is available no final proof that Boris Godunov murdered Tsar Feodor's brother Dmitri; and Professor Best's comment that the tsarist government was "not without corruption" is certainly a remarkable euphemism.

The reviewer might well add to the foregoing two further observations: (1) that it is certainly misleading to state "what was now entirely Russian was a violent brand of communism such as had its roots largely in the teachings of Bakunin . . . rather than in the milder . . . doctrines of Marxian socialism;" Marxian socialism, as originally expounded in the 1840s and later adopted by Lenin was itself extremely hardboiled and wanted no advice from Bakunin's anarchism; and (2) there is considerable evidence available to refute the author's belief that during World War II the Germans found little disaffection among the Russian population. In fact, Hitler made one of his greatest blunders in failing to take advantage of the obviously anti-Bolshevik sentiment in the Ukraine. His abuse of the natives inspired that fierce nationalism which Stalin knew how to exploit to his own ends.

This kind of criticism overlooks some of the solid virtues of *The Soviet State*. Professor Best is scrupulously objective in his evaluation of Soviet practice. There is no trace of the propagandist approach, pro or con, which mars so much writing on Russian affairs. And the appended bibliography is useful.

In the last analysis, however, this reviewer quite frankly found

the volume of limited value. It will command small interest from the well-informed; this was, perhaps, understood. But the author's eccentricity of expression, his consistent use of the subjunctive, his turgidity of phrase ("Moscow's glistening golden towers . . . a very dream of beauty and romance . . .") and the book's regrettably careless proof-reading may tend to discourage the kind of audience for which it was intended.

Douglas K. Reading, Colgate University.

Geography of the U. S. S. R.: A Regional Survey, by Theodore Shabad. New York. Columbia, 1951. pp. 497. \$8.50.

Because of the rapid internal growth, the many changes in economic philosophy, and the general lack of factual information on the internal composition of the Soviet Union, it has been extremely difficult to obtain an adequate and recent geography of the U. S. S. R. Mr. Shabad has achieved somewhat the impossible by concisely and systematically integrating a thorough and up-to-date presentation of the physical, the cultural, and the economic disciplines of regional Soviet geography.

Part I of the *Geography of the U. S. S. R.* serves as a general survey of the Soviet Union as a whole. Its purpose is to briefly describe the aspects of geology, relief, hydrography, climate, vegetation, soils, and mineral distribution; the population, its trends, and the present political organization; and the economic pattern of agriculture, industry, and transportation systems. Of particular value is the section devoted to the administrative-territorial divisions which explains the basic delineations of political breakdown.

Part II satisfies the aim of the author in an analysis of the major natural and economic regions. He describes in detail the administrative and economic particulars, including an urban study of the principle cities and towns. Each region, republic, and oblast is treated as an entity in itself in keeping with the Soviet economic policy of unit self-sufficiency. This method of presentation has proved very successful in giving complete representation to a country so varied in its extensiveness.

Each region is introduced by an overall survey which devotes special attention to the physical pattern. Following is a systematic breakdown of the various political divisions (chiefly by oblasts) which presents the detailed material pertinent to a regional geographical analysis and relates it to the total national economy.

It is in this aspect that the reviewer particularly recommends the book to students, research workers, and professional personnel interested in the Soviet Union. In these sections are found the details of internal Soviet geography in micro-representation. The material is as recent as could be had; it was collected largely after the second World War. The emphasis on the changing economy, inclusive of the fifth five-year plan, is well displayed in the discussions of agricultural and industrial developments.

Cartographically the book presents an adequate number of references and detailed maps which the reader finds himself constantly using. Other invaluable aids to complement the textual material are the recent statistical tables and an extensive bibliography and place name index.

The reviewer highly recommends this book primarily as a reference and secondly as a text for up-to-date factual material and a micro-analysis of the present day Soviet Union. It is one of the latest authorities contributing to the geographical knowledge on Soviet geography.

Alan S. Gardner, Saint Louis University.

Europe From 1914 to the Present, by Victor L. Albjerg and Marguerite Hall Albjerg. New York. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1951. pp. xii, 856. \$5.50.

Two factors must be taken into consideration in the evaluation of a book of this type. In the first place, it is almost axiomatic to say that real history cannot be written of our own times; we are still too close to many of the events to see them in their proper perspective. Secondly, the writing of a general textbook of eight hundred pages is an arduous task which demands a breadth of knowledge possessed by extremely few individuals in our times; mistakes in detail and in perspective are bound to occur.

Rumor and fact, relevant and irrelevant material are packed into this large volume. In a section at the very end of the book we find a treatment of "Conflicting Ideologies" and it is here that we find some clue to the difficulties of the book. Though the treatment of democracy is hazy, that of Italian fascism shows that the authors recognize its leader as no different in essence from a Nero, a Frederick II and a Henry VIII, with each taking a bow for his own excesses. And they correctly see in Nazism that same despotism, plus the Nationalist philosophy peculiar to

Hitlerian Germany. As such, Nazism and Fascism are old bottles with new labels.

It is when the authors come to the nature of Russian Communism that they do not see the point. They give as the *basic* concepts of Communism the economic interpretation of history, the theory of the class struggle, the labor theory of value without a bow to the Hegelian dialectic or the Marxian materialism which make those go. (They do give a bow to the Hegelian of our day, John Dewey, in the closing sentences in the book for his Hegelian "contributions" to America.) All the official acts of the Soviet Union are reducible to the dialectic materialism of Karl Marx and according to that philosophy man has no more rights than a desk, a pen or a mountain and he has no moral obligation to God, fellowmen or himself other than to help on the class struggle by any means. Those of us who believe in human rights do not like to see unexposed those who look sympathetically upon such a system either through ignorance or malice.

In this book this lack of understanding is shown in a multitude of ways. On page 124 the assertion is made that the Church did not give its blessing to the Red Revolution because it had lost its favored status and vast dominions and on page 150 is the statement, "The main reason for its adverse treatment was that a large element of its top hierarchy had betrayed the purpose for which the church had been established." The fact of the matter is that the Orthodox Church knew in 1917 that it would be doomed under the Marxian ideology and that the "adverse treatment" meted out to the Church was in line with and *prompted by* the philosophy of blotting out any relevancy in their civilization between man and spirit. The laconic statement after a rather lengthy treatment of the Russian Orthodox Church that, "After 1917 1,500 Roman [sic] Catholic Churches in Russian were closed," (p. 153) indicated that the authors should have known that their "main reason" did not fit the packet.

Always *a priori* reasons are found for events for which we know the reasons *a posteriori*. The Five Year Plan was started to build up for a war of defense, since Stalin was convinced that the rest of the world would not allow the Soviets to exist; we know from their fundamental philosophy, their mapped plans, their world-wide organization and their recent performance that the Soviet is never on the defensive. Collectivization was "in harmony with the Soviet economy"; we know that it was in

harmony with the Soviet philosophy which called for the reduction of man to the status of a truck animal because man has no spirit informing his body. The position of women is cleverly written up: women have equal rights with men—in a state where men have no rights, not even the right to have a men's club (p. 156). As for one million children in day nurseries while women have to toil in the factories and four million in day nurseries while women work on the farms (with time off every three hours for nursing), we would suggest that this is the way the good American farmer treats his mare, not his family. The Third International was operated because, "Fear of aggression led to Counteraggression" (p. 160).

The misconception of the calculated role of Soviet Russia in our own time carries the authors into the Cold War. All the incidents between the Soviet Union and the United States are the results of mutual antipathy; there is no satisfactory explanation attempted of that antipathy. The statement, "Each of the two international giants wanted to advance its own civilization, and each wished to protect itself against what it considered the encroachments of the other" (p. 637) betrays an attempted objectivity. If the authors had thus spoken of our relations with Hitler, we would consider the book at least integrated, even if it were bad history. The statement that "Moscow viewed the United States' interference in eastern Europe [Greece and Turkey] and the Mediterranean much as Washington would regard Russian interference in Central America and the Caribbean" (p. 795) is a strained, sentimental kind of tolerance.

This book cannot be recommended as a textbook. However, copies of the book should be preserved carefully in our libraries, so that the scholar two hundred years from now can learn how we did not understand our times.

Henry A. Callahan, Boston College.

Main Currents of Western Thought, edited by Franklin Le Van Baumer. New York. Alfred A. Knopf. 1952. pp. xvi, 699. \$5.50.

This is a collection of readings in Western European history from the Middle Ages down to Toynbee and Sartre. It is designed to serve the need for a selection of works in that *genre* now established as "intellectual history," and it therefore includes works from theologians, philosophers, scientists, social theorists, and

from popularizers of current "climates of opinion," such as Samuel Smiles in mid-nineteenth-century England.

Some will lament the omission of sources they consider important, and others will condemn the inclusion of authors they consider patently wrong in their views. Thus one could object to Freud being the only selection on "the nature of man" in our age, or to Sartre as the sole exponent of existentialism. Based on the criterion of influence on history—which this reviewer submits is the only correct criterion for inclusion in such a collection as this—the selections here included are as satisfactory as any other list would be. This collection will prove valuable for the student or instructor who wants to have handy the most important sources for Western social, cultural, and intellectual history.

Thomas P. Neill, Saint Louis University.

AMERICAN

The Catholic Church in Detroit, 1701-1888, by George Pare. Detroit. The Gabriel Richard Press. 1951. pp. xvi, 718. \$6.00.

This book might have been named the Catholic Church in OLD Detroit. Observe that it concludes in 1888. There is a compensation that it does not begin in 1701. Much enthralling history is here recorded that centered about The Straits before that date. The book comes as a memorial of the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the foundation in Detroit.

To the general reader the charm of the book will be the sparkle of the style of composition, the ease of the movement, the richness of detail, the precision of control through the ever-varying ups and downs and sudden curves, the high hopes and bitter disappointments, the loves and conflicts of the personages of the narrative. But this work is not merely an entertaining narrative, an ephemeral enjoyment; it is the outcome of long, painful, and critical research, and it consequently carries the impress of a permanency of value.

The professional historian, unlike the general reader, although he be delighted with the excellencies named above, will rather at first blush reserve his approval. For it is plain to see that the author has broken away from the norms of present day methods of presentation. A flagrant instance is the absence of a bibliography. Is this, however, an indication that the present volume

is number one of a series at the close of which a complete bibliography will appear? There is no other suggestion that future volumes by this author are contemplated. The footnotes, so unusually full and convincing, more than compensate for the want of any, even a well annotated, bibliography.

The author stresses for instance, the careers of the two ecclesiastics who loom large in the secular activities, or rather lack of activities, of Detroit, Fathers Gabriel Richard and Martin Kundig. How well-documented and consequently how accurate, and how interesting are these pages! They should not have been briefer.

On the theory that where there are hills there must be hollows, there will be mutes where we have had stresses. Detroit historians generally are silent about the Conspiracy of Orontoni, whom the French called Nicolas. When Pontiac was at the impressionable age of 14, he saw how nearly Orontoni came to exterminating the French. Had it not been for an Indian woman's confidence in a Jesuit Brother, Detroit might have been ravaged more completely by this Iroquois than in the uprising against the English alone by Pontiac. And in his very accurate and full story of Pontiac, if Mr. Richard Elliott's view of the disclosure of the conspiracy is accepted, should not Brother Pierre Gournay have been mentioned rather than his superior, Father Potier?

There was another silence, but it was only seeming, that surprised this reviewer. Turning to the Index to find the topic that interested him most of all, he failed to find any reference to the University of Detroit. The oversight was of the index maker. Reading the volume he came upon two mentions of the school. Similarly, he was so captivated by the story of Theresa Maxis, in Sister Rosalia's *No Greater Service*, that he sought her in the index also. She is named in the text, just named, not another word about her. But a footnote tells us where we can find all about Theresa, and a footnote told us where to secure reliable information about the University of Detroit. This is the method of Father Pare. He hurries over matter that is well known to give space to matters of importance that are very dimly known, or not at all. He gives us an instructive glance at the Polish Seminary and Father Grabowski. The faithful Indian Pokagon is not passed by; neither is Sister Françoise Vindevoghel, whose full-page portrait, like all the other illustrations are a credit to

the author and the Gabriel Richard Press, which is, as its seal described it *Deus ecclesiae et civitatis*.

L. J. Kenny, Saint Louis University.

The Confident Years, 1885-1915, by Van Wyck Brooks. New York. Dutton. 1952. pp. vii, 627. \$6.00.

The Confident Years is the fifth and final volume of Van Wyck Brooks' critical narrative of American literary culture. The complete work, *Makers and Finders. A History of the Writer in America*, utilizes a phrase by Walt Whitman in its title, and is indebted to this greatest and most native of our poets for a good deal more. In the Whitman spirit, Brooks presents his long account of our written heritage (the work ranges far beyond *belles lettres*) with loving appreciation of the largeness and variety of the American scene, and of the variety and importance of the American contribution to world cultural advancement. He has a conviction of the unique quality of the American social experiment, and a faith in the democratic assumptions of both our literary and political Founding Fathers. His five volumes are surely the largest project of literary criticism undertaken by a single American in recent decades, and now that they are impressively before us, it is of special interest to recall that the author once was a severe depreciator of the American tradition. It is probably true, as Bernard De Voto alleges, that Brooks was the leading spirit among the critics who, a generation or so ago, denounced the American past and present as decadently Puritan, grossly materialistic, and narrow and intolerantly provincial.

But Brooks, like most of those radical literati, subsequently re-discovered America, and did so with an ardor that made possible the first of the "Makers" volumes, that wonderfully evocative narrative synthesis of the great days of American literary-intellectual renaissance, *The Flowering of New England*. This volume proved the finest of the series, because of the lyric intensity of Brooks' rediscovery, and the unity and transcendent (no pun) importance of the period. But other volumes have been of high distinction, too. To each the critic has brought a sympathetic knowledge of a bewildering number of writers and their social and intellectual environments.

In the present work Brooks completes his long account, arriving in spite of what the title indicates, virtually at the present,

in a consideration in the last two chapters of writers who are still prominent. The story Brooks has to tell this time has been told at least in part by many literary historians, most recently by Alfred Kazin, Oscar Cargills, Clarence Gohdes, and George F. Whicher, and Grant C. Knight, but no one so far has been able to match Brooks' combination of inclusiveness, evocative power, and dependability of evaluation. Brooks has in exceptional degree that first of critical virtues, the ability to communicate the quality of widely different literary personalities and the particular milieu in which they move.

The author has been criticized in some quarters for devoting considerable space to quite minor figures, and for discussing merely popular literature. I am glad he was so inclusive. His book attempts to be a story of our total literary culture since 1885, the good and the bad included for a fuller understanding of what was going on. Thus he does not hesitate to devote a page or two to a minor, but interestingly symptomatic writer such as Josiah Flynt, the well born and highly endowed romanticist of hobo life; and tells us about the vogue of the Graustarckian novel for what it reveals of our culturally, socially self-conscious classes in this period. In his Whitman-esque inclusiveness, Brooks caresses the whole of our literary-intellectual culture, confident that his discrimination is not thereby compromised. He knows that our progress depends on the small contributions, too, and believes that there is finally gain even from occasional reactions into banality and error. He has faith that our giants exert their steady directive power in the longer stretches of time.

John C. Bushman, Saint Louis University.

The Liquor Tax in the United States, 1791-1947, by Tun Yuan Hu. New York. Columbia University Graduate School of Business. 1950. pp. 188.

This is the first publication of the Columbia University Graduate School of Business Monographs in Public Finance and National Income. The institution is frankly experimenting with this new series in the hope that dissertations of value may not be limited to microfilm copies, the publication medium now accepted by Columbia University for graduate dissertations.

As might be expected from the graduate source, this book is heavily larded with financial and other statistics. For some the introduction will be most useful. For others the figures will

not mean too much. Apparently Dr. Hu set out to do a statistical dissertation and found that he could not discover enough information to finish that sort of study. Historically, the monograph is a little thin, but adequate. No one has previously attempted to carry through a study of the liquor tax in America. The subject has its interests. Probably the monograph would have been handled much better by an historian than it has been by a statistician.

J. P. Donnelly, Saint Louis University.

Bourbon Democracy in Alabama, 1874-1890, by Allen Johnston Going. University of Alabama Press. 1951. pp. ix, 256. \$4.00.

The purpose of this study is to analyze and describe the state government of Alabama as it operated under the Democratic party during the sixteen year period from 1874 to 1890. The bellum and post bellum interval before 1874 was previously covered in Walter L. Fleming's *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* and the years after 1890 have been treated in John B. Clark's *Populism in Alabama*.

The term Bourbon (used by the Radical Republicans during Reconstruction to label their Democratic opponents as anti-progressive and ultra-conservative) is applied only in this treatise when it can be used literally. The author has raised the question—and has provided an adequate answer—of how conservative, or Bourbon, Alabama Democrats were in actual practice for the years under consideration. The evidence presented indicates that the term Bourbon in its literal sense does not accurately describe the Alabama Democratic party and government of this period. Some Democrats held an extremely conservative attitude toward debt adjustment, encouragement of immigration, concessions to business and industry, and further expansion of governmental activities. Other Democrats within the state believed that progressive thinking and action were necessary on these same issues.

During the years immediately following the Democratic victory over the Radical Republicans in 1874, a conservative, agrarian minded policy prevailed in the Democratic party and government in Alabama. The reduction of governmental salaries and expenditures was required by the Constitution of 1875, as well as prohibitions against increased taxes and state aid to industry and railroads. But the restored conservative order did not attempt to alter the many innovations and changes made

in the interest of the masses, both black and white, during Reconstruction, such as the popular election of judicial officials, or the policy of public school education. Bourbon conservatism likewise gave way on the important question of debt adjustment by reducing only the interest on the Alabama debt incurred during Reconstruction. During the 1880's more and more Democratic leaders and newspapers of Alabama were advocating a forward-looking, New South policy. They urged the legislature to renew state aid to railroad building, to grant additional concessions to new industries and to encourage immigration.

Alabama Democrats reigned supreme on the state political front after 1876. They made sure of retaining their control and of stifling any resurgence of the Republican-Negro combination by revising election laws and by employing various methods to control or nullify the Negro and other non-Democratic votes. However, various threats to Democratic supremacy arose within the party from time to time because of disagreement and threatened bolts. The most effective methods used for preserving party harmony were the avoidance of controversial issues and the emphasis in every campaign on white versus Negro rule.

In final analysis, this volume is a case study in southern political Bourbonism of the post Reconstruction years, for the patterns that emerge are not unlike those found in similar studies of other former Confederate states. The author's research is adequate but not exhaustive. His conclusions demonstrate depth of interpretation and understanding. This book is truly the conclusive study in its field.

LeRoy H. Fischer, Oklahoma A. & M. College.

Fr. Paul of Graymoor, by David Gannon. New York. Macmillan. 1951. pp. xxi, 372. \$4.00.

To those who are interested in the history of the Catholic Church in America, there are few more engaging episodes than the conversion of Fr. Paul and his establishment of the religious of Graymoor. This man, born Lewis Wattson, was the son of a High Church Episcopalian clergyman, who was interested in the American phase of the Oxford Movement. Lewis, likewise, entered the ministry and served as a zealous worker in various Eastern pulpits.

Seeking to follow a monastic vocation within the Anglican Church, he first joined a group of ministers in Omaha who were

leading a common life. Disappointed in this group, he was led after a few years to establish his own order, the Society of the Atonement, following the Franciscan ideal. It was the influence of the saintly Sister Laurana, another Anglican, that persuaded him to take this step, and with her he established the First and Second Orders of the Atonement.

They Settled at Graymoor, New York, where amid great hardships they labored to restore religious life among their fellow Anglicans. Their special aim was unity among Christians, and it was Fr. Paul who began what was to be called "The Chair of Unity Octave." Convinced that only by means of union with Rome could real unity be achieved, they sought to spread this idea in an effort towards cooperate union. Despairing of this possibility and convinced that they could wait no longer, Fr. Paul and the Society of the Atonement were received into the Catholic Church there to labor as a religious order of the Church. Within the Church they continue their efforts towards unity.

This is the story Fr. Gannon tells in this book. He tells it well and seems to have avoided pitfalls of partiality, the common danger to those who write the lives of their religious founders. He presents to us a clear and well-documented account of this very human yet saintly man.

Robert V. Callen, St. Mary's College.

The New Nation: A History of the United States During the Confederation, 1781-1789, by Merrill Jensen. New York. Alfred A. Knopf. 1950. pp. xvii, 433, xi. \$5.00.

The *New Nation* is unquestionably a good account of the confederation period. It does not replace or make obsolete other monographs in the field, but it is a worthy addition to them. Professor Jensen has drawn from excellent and varied source material, in particular early newspapers and magazines, state legislation, manuscripts from the Library of Congress and from the various historical society collections. Adequate footnoting plus a brief essay on the sources serves as a sufficient, but difficult-to-use, bibliography.

The author is very unsympathetic to the so-called "traditional viewpoint" which holds that this period was one of desperation, years of "stagnation and decay." In short, he rejects the John Fiske school of thought as valueless history. This rejection is hardly startling in as much as it is neither new nor original.

Yet the honest and forthright approach is extremely refreshing. Professor Jensen believes the confederation period to be one of great significance, and in this sense a "critical period." New, difficult and serious problems were ever present, but none the less this was a period of important economic growth and political development.

The book contains a superabundance of factual material which is of course useful, but which unfortunately detracts somewhat from clarity and readability. Then too, the topical treatment always disturbs chronology. The reviewer suggests that those somewhat familiar with the period will find this work of more value and more interest than will the beginner.

Edward J. Maguire, Saint Louis University.

Catholic Authors, by Matthew Hoehn, O.S.B. Newark. St. Mary's Abbey. 1952. pp. xiv, 633. \$6.50.

There is hardly a librarian or a person in any way interested in literature in England and America who has not used the original edition of this book. We now have a new publication of the subject. As far as the present reviewer can tell the author has completely re-worked the book, dropping out and adding as need demanded. It is hardly necessary to review this book. The need it fills is so obvious that one must only be certain that everyone knows the new edition is out and it will be promptly purchased by every library, newspaper, magazine and person who has need for a ready source of information about the subject.

A great deal of careful work has gone into the book. The most important single feature about it is that readers may depend on what is in the book about each author. This sort of reference tool is, of course, only as good as it is dependable. In this case, since each author included has been, himself, the author of information about himself, we have the best possible source of information. Or at least we have as much information as a given author is willing to contribute about himself.

There is one notable lack in the book. Father Matthew Hoehn is not included among the authors about whom information is given. This modesty is admirable, but we want the lack filled in a future edition.

J. P. Donnelly, Saint Louis University.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is intended to be of service to teachers and students of history by presenting a fairly complete list of historical works announced or published since the previous issue of *The Historical Bulletin*. An asterisk denotes a review of the book in this or a later issue. Unfortunately sometimes the price and number of pages were not obtainable.

MEDIAEVAL

- Altan Toboi, Harvard. pp. 389. \$5.00 (paper).
 Ambrose, St., *The Explanatio Symboli ad Initiandos*. Cambridge. pp. 39. \$2.00.
 *Artz, Frederick, *The Mind of the Middle Ages*. Knopf. pp. 552. \$5.75 (Text ed.).
 Boyd, C.E., *Tithes and Parishes in Medieval Italy*. Cornell. U. Press. pp. 291. \$4.00.
 Brown, E.F., *Gaul Is Divided*. William-Frederick. pp. 268. \$4.00.
 Clark, K.W., *Checklist of Manuscripts in St. Catherine's Monastery*. Lib. of Congress. pp. 62. \$.50.
 *Dahmus, Joseph, *The Prosecution of John Wyclif*. Yale Univ. pp. 167. \$4.00.
 deGrazia, Alfred, *The Elements of Political Science*. Knopf. pp. 677. \$5.50.
 Francis of Assisi, St., *The Words of Saint Francis*. Franciscan Herald Press. pp. 353. \$3.00.
 Gilmore, M.P., *The World of Humanism, 1453-1517*. Harper. pp. 341. \$5.00.
 *Goodman, Paul, *History of the Jews*. Dutton. pp. 254. \$3.50.
 Hill, Herbert, *The Roman Middle Class in the Republican Period*. Macmillan. pp. 237. \$3.00.
 *Lecler, Joseph, *The Two Sovereignities*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 196. \$3.75.
 *Papini, Giovanni, *Michelangelo*. Dutton. pp. 542. \$10.00.
 Sarton, G.A.L., *A History of Science*. Harvard. pp. 672. \$10.00.
 Siwek, Paul, *The Enigma of the Hereafter*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 140. \$3.00.
 Soothill, W.E., *The Hall of Light*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 311. \$7.50.

MODERN

- Ashworth, William, *A Short History of International Economy, 1850-1950*. Longmans. pp. 256. \$3.25.
 Bailey, S.D., *Parliamentary Government in Southern Asia*. Inst. of Pacific Relations. pp. 27. \$.30 (paper).
 Ballantine, J.W., *Formosa*. Brookings Inst. pp. 229. \$2.75.
 Becker, C.L., *Modern History* 1952 ed. Silver Burdett. pp. 943. \$4.24.
 *Brandt, Conrad, et al., *A Documentary History of Chinese Communism*. Harvard. pp. 552. \$7.50.
 Friedmann. W.G., *An Introduction to World Politics*. St. Martin's Press. pp. 398. \$3.00.
 Geyl, Pieter, *From Ranke to Toynbee*. Smith College. pp. 85. \$2.00 (paper).
 Hill, Sir George F., *A History of Cyprus*. v. 4. Cambridge Univ. pp. 671. \$13.50.

- *Himmelfarb, Gertrude, *Lord Acton*. Univ. of Chicago. pp. 270. \$3.75.
- *Mackie, J.D., *The Earlier Tudors, 1485-1558*. Oxford. pp. 720. \$7.00.
- MacCoby, Simon, *The English Radical Tradition, 1763-1914*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 249. \$3.50.
- Nobbs, Douglas, *England and Scotland, 1560-1707*. Longmans. pp. 173. \$1.80 (text ed.).
- Peterson, A.D.C., *A Hundred Years of Education*. Macmillan. pp. 272. \$3.25.
- Riasanovsky, N.V., *Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles*. Harvard. pp. 244. \$6.00.
- Reischauer, E.O., *Japan, Past and Present*. Knopf. pp. 314. \$2.85.
- Robb, D.M., and Garrison, J.J., *Art in the Western World*. Harper. pp. 1066. \$6.00.
- Ross Williamson, Hugh, *The Gunpowder Plot*. Macmillan. pp. 301. \$4.50.
- Stout, H.M., *British Government*. Oxford. pp. 433. \$5.00.
- Wilson, H.E., and Lamb, W.E., *American History*. Amer. Bk. pp. 648. \$3.24.
- Taylor, Telford, *Sword and Swastika*. Simon Schuster. pp. 444. \$5.00.
- Trevelyan, G.M., *Illustrated English Social History*, v. 4. Longmans. pp. 197. \$5.50.
- Van de Pol, W.H., *The Christian Dilemma*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 317. \$4.75.
- Waltz, Emelyn, *Far Eastern History*. Christopher. pp. 578. \$5.00.
- Wilbur, M.K.E., *The Unquenchable Flame*. Hastings House. pp. 349. \$5.00.

AMERICAN

- Betts, A.D., *History of South Carolina Methodism*. Advocate Press. pp. 544. \$5.00.
- Carr, R.K., *The House Committee on Un-American Activities*. Cornell Univ. pp. 502. \$6.50.
- Caparo, J.A., *Desire for Gold and Conquest*. Christopher, pp. 736. \$5.00.
- Christensen, E.O., *Early American Wood Carving*. World. pp. 149. \$4.00.
- Clement, W.E., and Landry, S.O., *Plantation Life on the Mississippi*. Pelican.
- *Cumberland, C.C., *Mexican Revolution*. Univ. of Texas. pp. 307. \$5.00.
- *Dearing, Mary, *Veterans in Politics*. La. State Univ. pp. 521. \$6.00.
- DeVoto, B.A., *The Course of Empire*. Houghton. pp. 664. \$6.00.
- Fifield, R.H., *Woodrow Wilson and the Far East*. Crowell. pp. 398. \$5.00.
- *Govan, G.E., and Livingood, J.W., *The Chattanooga Country, 1540-1951*. Dutton. pp. 509. \$5.00.
- Hacker, L.M., and Zahler, H.S., *The United States in the Twentieth Century*. Appleton. pp. 711. \$5.50.
- Horne, H.H., *Lincoln and Greeley*. Univ. of Ill. pp. 440. \$6.00.
- Hefner, R.D., *A Documentary History of the United States*. Ind. Univ. pp. 287. \$3.00, & New Amer. Lib. pp. 287. \$.35 (paper).
- Higgingbotham, S.W., *The Keystone in the Democratic Arch: Pennsylvania Politics, 1800-1816*. Pa. State Historical and Mus. Commission. pp. 427. \$3.00.

- Jackson, W.T., *Wagon Roads West*. Univ. of Calif. pp. 437. \$5.00.
- John, Evan, pseud, *Atlantic Impact 1861*. Putnam. pp. 305. \$3.75.
- Kennan, G.F., *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950*. New Amer. Lib. pp. 144. \$.35 (paper).
- Kipnis, Ira, *The American Socialist Movement, 1897-1912*. Columbia Univ. pp. 496. \$6.00.
- *Mark, Irving, and Schwab, E.L., *The Faith of Our Fathers*. Knopf. pp. 393. \$5.00.
- Mitchell, Ruth, *My Brother Billy*. Harcourt. pp. 344. \$4.00.
- Posey, W.B., *The Presbyterian Church in the Old Southwest, 1778-1838*. John Knox. pp. 192. \$2.50.
- Nasatir, A.P., *Before Lewis and Clark*. St. Louis Historical Documents Foundation. 2v. pp. 868. \$15.00.
- Rosenberger, F.C., *Jefferson Reader*. Dutton. pp. 349. \$5.00.
- *Sanger, D.B., and Hay, T.R., *James Longstreet*. La. State Univ. pp. 460. \$6.50.
- Sellards, E.H., *Early Man in America*. Univ. of Texas. pp. 227. \$4.50.
- Sibley, G.C., *The Road to Santa Fe*. Univ. of New Mexico pp. 288. \$4.50.
- Starr, E.C., *A Baptist Bibliography*. Amer. Baptist Historical Soc. pp. 323. \$3.00 (paper).
- Swanton, J.R., *The Indian Tribes of North America*. Smithsonian Inst. pp. 732. \$3.50.
- *Tindall, G.B., *South Carolina Negroes, 1877-1900* Univ. of S.C. pp. 348. \$5.00.
- Woldman, A.A., *Lincoln and the Russians*. World. pp. 320. \$5.00.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

A new revised impression of the Historical Bulletin History Outline Series is now in press. Despite the sharp rise in cost of production and distribution we have been able to keep our increase in price at a minimum. The new outlines will be available within several weeks.

NEW PRICE SCHEDULE

Ancient and Medieval History	-	-	-	50c
Modern European History	-	-	-	50c

Twenty percent reduction on orders of ten or more.

We pay postage on all orders.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

A Jesuit Institution

Founded 1818



"Democracy is built upon the
bedrock of Christian education..."

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

Labor College
School of Law
Graduate School
School of Divinity
School of Nursing
School of Dentistry
School of Medicine
Institute of Technology
School of Social Service
Institute of Social Science
College of Arts and Sciences
College of Philosophy and Letters
School of Commerce and Finance
Parks College of Aeronautical Technology

CORPORATE COLLEGES

Webster College
Maryville College
Fontbonne College
St. Mary's Junior College
Notre Dame Junior College

Saint Louis University owns and operates

Radio Station WEW

Saint Louis 3

Missouri